THE PEOPLE OF THE BOOK

By
SAMUEL ROSENBLATT

DS143
.R81

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 9 1945
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

DS143
.R81

THE PEOPLE OF THE BOOK

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 9 1945
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BY

SAMUEL ROSENBLATT, PH. D.

Rabbi of the Beth Tfiloh Congregation
in Baltimore, Maryland

Lecturer on Jewish Literature
at the Johns Hopkins University

BEHRMAN'S JEWISH BOOK HOUSE
PUBLISHERS · NEW YORK

1943

Copyright 1943
SAMUEL ROSENBLATT

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
THE LORD BALTIMORE PRESS
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

To

MORRES SHUGER

philanthropist, patron of Jewish learning,
upholder of the traditions of his people

Other Books by the Same Author

•

THE HIGH WAYS TO PERFECTION OF ABRAHAM MAIMONIDES
VOL. I
Columbia University Press, New York, 1927

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE BIBLE IN THE MISHNAH
The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1935

THE HIGH WAYS TO PERFECTION OF ABRAHAM MAIMONIDES
VOL. II
The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1938

OUR HERITAGE
Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1940

THIS IS THE LAND
Mizrachi Organization of America, New York, 1940

IN LIEU OF A PREFACE

DEAR READER:

In the Bible of the Mohammedans, known as the Koran, one comes very frequently across the expression "the people of the book." When he used this title, the prophet of Islam had in mind first and foremost the followers of the religion from which his own faith as well as Christianity were derived. It is of this people and of the book it gave to the world that the ensuing pages propose to treat. They shall speak of them neither apologetically nor boastfully, neither in praise nor in blame, but in a simple, frank, forthright manner, their object being merely to call attention to facts not generally known or hidden in learned tomes which renders them inaccessible to any but professional scholars.

With this foreword I bespeak your indulgence and interest as I attempt to unfold the drama of the aforementioned people and its book.

S. R.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE PEOPLE

PAGE

I. Race, Nationality or Religious Community? 3
II. The Trail of the Refugees 10
III. Under the Crescent 19
IV. Forearmed 27
V. The Rebirth of a People 35
VI. The Holy Cities of the Holy Land 48

THE BOOK

I. It Sold More Copies Than "Gone With the Wind" 61
II. The King's English 70
III. The Scroll and the Cross 76
IV. Mohammed's Jewish Teachers 85
V. God Has Not Changed 96

PEOPLE OF THE BOOK

I. "With All Thy Life" 107
II. From Moses to Moses 122
III. A Gift to France 131
IV. The Minnesinger of Zion 134

NOTES 141

THE PEOPLE

"Lo, it is a people that shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations."

Numbers 23, 9

"There is a certain people scattered abroad and dispersed among the peoples in all the provinces of thy kingdom; and their laws are diverse from those of every people . . . ."

Esther 3, 8

RACE, NATIONALITY OR RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY?

Ever since the French Revolution brought the promise of civic equality to the Jew, friends and foes of Jewry have been wrangling over the question of whether Jews constitute a nationality or a religious community. The former, including liberals like Mirabeau and Robespierre,[1] have contended that the term "Jew" connoted nothing else than the follower of a certain creed just as did the designation of individuals as "Catholic" or "Protestant," and that the Jewish residents of a country were, therefore, as much entitled to the full rights of citizenship as all other inhabitants. The reactionaries, on the other hand, have always tried to prove that the Jews represented, as Napoleon Bonaparte's minister of public worship Portalis put it, "much less a religious sect than a people" (bien moins une réligion qu'un peuple)[2] and were hence not deserving of treatment as citizens. Since the rise of modern anti-semitism at the end of the last century a third characterization has been added to these two to befuddle the mind of the student of this ethnic phenomenon. Jews have been described as a race,[3] i.e., as descendants of a particular human stock possessing readily distinguishable physical features as well as mental and moral traits, on account of which they are either liked or disliked by the rest of humanity. This theory has today been fully exploited by the proponents of the Nazi philosophy of racialism, and on the basis thereof millions of innocent human beings have been marked out for persecution. The religious affiliation or the political views of the victims do not come into consideration. A person may be a devout Catholic or a Protestant and never have had the remotest connection with socialism or communism or some other now-forbidden movement. So long as there flows in his veins that so-called Jewish blood, so long as there has been grafted on somewhere in his family-tree a branch of the hated stock, he becomes thereby unfit to live in an Aryan world.[4]

The question of whether Jews constitute a race, a nationality or a religious community is, therefore, at present not a matter of purely academic interest. With the answer to it may be bound up the welfare, the fate, of countless men and women who are earmarked by that label. And even if it could be hoped that in the

course of time the current anti-semitic mania, that has gripped a large part of the world, should peter out and the pseudo-science of racialism should be discredited, it will still be necessary to determine whether Jews are to be put into the category of nationality or religion. It will be of import particularly when the issue of the apportionment of land to various persecuted peoples will be raised at the conclusion of the present world-conflict, that is, in the event of an Allied victory. There are, for instance, Jews today that insist upon the creation of an independent Jewish state, believing as they do that national autonomy is the only solution of the two-thousand-year-old Jewish problem. Others, again, affirm with equal ardor that the establishment of such a commonwealth would be a calamity for Jews as a whole as well as the gravest injustice to those Jewish communities of the disapora that still enjoy civic liberties. That is why it is so pertinent to ask what Jews really are, whether they constitute a race, a nationality, or a religious community.

In order to rule out the first of the three possible classifications that have been mentioned, it is not necessary to take the word of anthropologists like Franz Boas or Dr. Maurice Fishberg, the author of "The Racial Characteristics of the Jews," [5] for it that Jews are not a pure race, i.e., offspring of a certain definite human strain with which no intermingling from without has taken place. The most authoritative collection of Jewish traditions, which even the most ardent advocates of the doctrine of Jewish racial purity recognize, the Mishnah, edited by Rabbi Judah the Patriarch, bears eloquent testimony to this fact. In the fourth chapter of the treatise of Kiddushin, namely, there is found a statement to the effect that among the various categories of Jews who returned from Babylonia to Palestine after the first exile was included that of the *Gerim,* i.e., non-Jews who had entered the Jewish fold. And lest anyone imagine that these proselytes did not enter into nuptial relations with full-blooded Jews, this impression is corrected by the remark, immediately following, that even the first generation of these *Gerim,* i.e., the converts themselves, might intermarry with all classes of Jews outside of *Kohanim.* With so clear and irrefragable a refutation, by so reputed a source of Jewish tradition as the Mishnah, of the alleged purity of the Jewish race, all further evidence becomes superfluous. There is no need to point out, for instance, the fact that there was a non-Jewish strain in the blood of King David, whose great-grandmother, according to the Bible, was the Moabitess Ruth; [6] or that some of the foremost Jewish scholars of the

Talmudic period, like Shemaya and Abtalion,[7] the predecessors and teachers of Hillel and Shammai,[8] as well as Onkelos, the author of the official and generally accepted translation of the Pentateuch into Aramaic,[9] and the Tannaite Rabbi Meir,[10] are all of them said to have been of non-Jewish descent.

Reliable scientific opinion, as has been noted before, fully agrees with the testimony of tradition. There are no such things as distinctive Jewish features. There exists no way of telling a Jew from a gentile by looks alone. There are Jews that have the appearance of non-Jews and non-Jews who resemble Jews. For the sake of illustration take the case of a downtown congregation in Baltimore that needed a tenth man to make a minyan (quorum for public prayer) and hailed a bewildered gentleman from the street to stay with them for the duration of the services. When the prayers were over, they discovered to their discomfiture that the supposed Jew was an Italian Catholic. There is also the story about a typically Irish-looking lad—freckle-faced and pug-nosed—who used to make the furnace every Sabbath morning for an Orthodox Jewish family, acting as what is known as the "Shabbos Goy." One Saturday he failed to show up, and when the next week his employers asked him about the reason for his absence, he answered entirely unembarrassed: "I had to be in Schul (synagogue) for my Bar-Mitzvah (confirmation)." The fact is that looks are deceiving. The so-called Jewish nose, hooked like an eagle, isn't Jewish at all. It is really Roman, and less than twenty per cent of the Jews hailing from eastern Europe, according to Dr. Fishberg, wear it. Also there are almost as many fair-haired and blond-eyed Jews and Jewesses as there are those of the swarthy and dark-eyed variety.

Now, of course, Jews are to some extent different from their non-Jewish neighbors. The Talmud already observes: "This nation is known by three characteristics—merciful, chaste, and charitable." [11] But these aren't physical features. They are psychological traits, modes of behavior and attitudes acquired by dint of years of training and discipline.

The racial label is, therefore, ruled out. Jews who acknowledge their Jewishness may believe themselves to be lineal descendents of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But whether they really are the offspring of the Hebrew patriarchs and that there is none but Jewish blood flowing in the veins, or at what point in their genealogy foreign corpuscles filtered in, very few have records of family-trees going back far enough to determine.

There remain, then, the two other characterizations of Jews: their classification either as a nationality [12] or as members of a religious denomination. Into which of these two definitions do they fit best? What is the most comprehensive bond among Jews, that of nationhood or religious belief? The first guess would be that it is the latter. Judaism possesses all the earmarks of a religion, just like Christianity or Mohammedanism or other faiths. Like them it has its Holy Scriptures, its conception of God, places of worship, ritual, divine services, and a clergy. How else, in the face of these tokens, is one to characterize Jews if not as a religious sect? And yet one may very appropriately ask, like the Jewish defendant, who, after having under duress defined the "Shofar" (the ram's horn sounded on the Jewish New Year's festival) as a sort of trumpet and having thereupon been reprimanded by the judge for not having given this information right away, countered with the question: "But, your Honor, is the Shofar really a trumpet?"—one may very appropriately ask: "Are Jews really nothing more than a religious community?"

Let us see. When a person applies for admission to the Christian or the Moslem faiths, for instance, all that is demanded of him is that he accept the authority of the New Testament and profess his belief in the Savior in the one case or that he acknowledge the unity of God and the mission of the Mohammed in the other. "There is no God but Allah and Mohammed is His Prophet"—that is all there is to the Mohammedan confession of faith. There is no question of identification with a particular people or nationality. The candidate for conversion retains, after his admission to the fold of the faithful, outside of having changed his creed, the very same status he had occupied previously. He remains exactly what he was before—an Englishman or a Frenchman, a Persian or an Arab. There occurs no transfer of loyalty or allegiance. It is entirely different when an individual decides to become a Jew. He is first of all, by the very act of conversion, made to enter into the covenant of Israel's ancestor Abraham, as whose descendant he henceforth regards himself.[13] He is furthermore told that "all Jews"—note the use of the adjective *all*—"are surety for one another's welfare." [14] And when he says his daily prayers in the synagogue he voices the hope that God might "gather His exiled children" and Himself return to Zion—"And may our eyes behold Thy return unto Zion in mercy." No matter how one would figure it, such a system of practices and beliefs constitutes more than simply a re-

ligion. It contains elements that have nothing to do with a mere creed, features that are the indubitable traits of nationality.

Now there are, of course, Jews who would like to lop off these national aspects of Judaism, who would deny their Jewish past by referring to themselves as something like "Germans of Mosaic persuasion" rather than "Jews," who claim to have nothing in common with their Jewish brethren elsewhere in the world except religious belief, who have expunged from the prayerbook of the synagogue every reference to Zion.[15] But in so doing they have mutilated the organism that was once known as Judaism; they have changed its nature beyond recognition; they have run counter to a tradition nearly 4,000 years old; they have destroyed the very thing that gave it its distinctive character. It was precisely the national aspects of the Jewish religion that made it necessary for those persons, who were ready to accept its teachings about God and who were intrigued by its religious institutions like the Sabbath and endorsed the ethics of the Bible but did not care to throw in their lot with the Jewish people, it was precisely these features of the traditional Jewish faith that made them found such non-national religions as Christianity and Mohammedanism.[16] When a Jew discards the things that made Judaism a national religion, there is really no valid reason, under the trials to which Jews are today exposed and the suffering to which they are subjected, for his remaining in the fold. If he cannot bear to go so far as to accept the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Virgin Birth, he could become a Unitarian and thereby rid himself forever of all the troubles and burdens of being a Jew.

However, not all Jews agree with the anti-nationalists and not all are willing to follow the logic of their philosophy. The majority of believing Jews still adhere to the national religion. They are proud of their Jewish descent. They are genuinely and deeply concerned about the fate of their kinsmen and coreligionists abroad wherever they may live and whatever their political allegiance may be, whether they be French or German or Polish or Russian or Greek Jews, aye far more concerned than the Irish Catholics of America, for instance, are about the fortunes of the Polish Catholics of Poland. One need but consider the huge sums collected by American Jewry for the relief of the stricken Jewish communities of Europe to realize that there is a stronger bond among Jews than among the sections of adherents of any other creed. Finally most Jews, be they active and duly registered Zionists or not, still

have a warm spot in their hearts for Mother Zion, and while they may not do very much to help the cause of the rebuilding of the Jewish national home in Palestine, they will at least not oppose the effort. Herzl was right when he thought that the Jewish masses would follow him.[17] The fact is that they did, because the two-thousand-year-old longing for a return to Zion had never completely died.

Jews are, then, more than a religious sect. They exhibit all the earmarks of nationality. They share a common past. They are beset everywhere by practically the same problems. They cherish on the whole similar aspirations. They possess a national language, a national culture, and a distinctive national art. They lay claim to a national center upon which they have again in our day more than impressed their individual character. Yet with all that, even if the dream of an independent Jewish commonwealth on the soil of the ancient Land of Israel were to be realized, the Jews would not constitute just a nation like other nations. Jews have no territorial ambitions. It is not their aim to conquer the globe. It is inconceivable that even with a Jewish state in Palestine Jews living outside of the borders of the homeland could ever act as fifth-columnists for a government intent on swallowing the world. If Jews call themselves "the chosen people," [18] it is not for the subjugation and the enslavement of mankind by the might of their arms that they consider themselves to have been elected, but to become "a light unto the nations" [19] by the force of example. This is proven among other things by the memories cherished by Jewry of its olden state on the most solemn Jewish festival. What is it that the Jew recalls in the liturgy of the Day of Atonement? What sort of mementos does it evoke? Battles, wars, conquests, martial prowess, territorial expansion, wordly riches? No. He thinks only of the glories of the Temple—"Happy the eye that hath seen these things!" He brings to mind the service of the high priest. He commemorates his martyred teachers, the expounders of the Law who were put to death by the Roman government. He makes mention of the fact that of all the wealth bequeathed to him by his forbears the Torah alone remains—"We have no remnant but this Torah." Herein lies the mission, the raison d'être of the Jewish people. As the Gaon of Sura, Saadyah, once expressed it: "We are a nation only by virtue of the Torah." [20] The Jew's claim to national existence is justified by his desire for the opportunity and the privilege to live the life of the Torah.

What are Jews, then, if they are not a pure race, nor merely a religious sect, nor a nation like other nations? Our answer is that they are a religious people just as their religion is, notwithstanding its universal outlook, a national religion. Religion and nationalism are both of them essential factors of traditional Judaism. That was emphasized long ago by the tragic prophet Jonah. When asked by the mariners on the ship on which he had attempted to flee from his divinely ordained mission to what people he belonged, he replied: "I am an Hebrew." [21] And when they furthermore inquired about his profession, his vocation in life, he answered: "I fear the Lord, the God of heaven, who made the sea and the dry land." [22]

Because the Jewish religion is a national religion, it needs a home of its own where it could be practiced freely without let or hindrance. Ever so many precepts of Judaism are bound up with the soil of the Holy Land.[23] Again only Palestine can become the seat of a real Jewish Sanhedrin, with all the prestige of so august a body of Jewish legislators and arbiters of Jewish living.[24] There has never existed such an authority outside of the confines of the Land of Israel. On the other hand, because the Jewish people is above all a religious people, one whose chief vocation is its creed, Jewish nationalism can never come into conflict with the Jew's duties to his adopted fatherland. Patriotism to the country of his residence, concern for the welfare of the state in the midst of which the Jew lived, have always gone hand in hand with loyalty to his own people. More than twenty-five hundred years ago the prophet Jeremiah counselled the Jewish exiles who had been carried off to Babylon, to be solicitous for the peace of the city whither God had banished them, because with its well-being was bound up their own.[25] This injunction has not lost any of its weight today. It applies now with greater force than it ever did before.

THE TRAIL OF THE REFUGEES

A little less than one hundred years ago there appeared in France a novel from the pen of one Eugene Sue entitled "Le Juif Errant," "The Wandering Jew." It had nothing to do with the Jewish race as such, being based upon a legend concerning a Jewish shoemaker of Jerusalem who is supposed to have taunted Jesus on the way to his crucifixion, and to whom the latter is said to have remarked: "Go on forever until I return." As a consequence this Jew is believed never to have died but, assuming different guises in different ages and turning up in various climes and places, to have continued to live until this very day.

All this is, of course, pure fiction. Yet, like most fictions, this one too harbors a kernel of historic truth that no doubt gave rise to the two-fold phenomenon of the miraculous survival and the eternal wanderings of the most persecuted of all the families of man—the Children of Israel. Not that Jews are the only wanderers on the face of the earth. Migration is a common human trait. The English did not always inhabit England, nor did the French originate in France, nor do the Russians, the Germans, the Poles, and the Czechs hail from the territory they now occupy. All of these came from elsewhere, and it is of course a well known fact that the whites as well as the blacks presently living in the Western Hemisphere are immigrants, aye, recent immigrants from abroad. Yet there is no people with so long and chequered an odyssey in the full light of history as the Jewish. Its peregrinations have taken place not at intervals of a thousand or half a thousand years. Every few centuries and even less have Jews been compelled to leave the places in which they had established themselves, where the bones of their fathers were buried, where they had built synagogues and other institutions, and look for new homes.

This happened to many Jews less than sixty years ago when the fury of the government-engineered pogroms and the cruel restrictions of the Czars forced them out of the Russian inferno. It occurred prior to that during the periods of reaction in Central Europe in the first half of the nineteenth century, which drove thousands of Jewish as well as Christian Germans to the hospitable shores of the United States of America. It took place when the monstrous

Inquisition ejected the Jews from Spain, where they had been domiciled for over a thousand years; and when royal greed expelled them from England and France. Thus down to the time when the Romans, after destroying the second temple, led Jewish warriors captive to Rome, do we find the Jew zigzagging back and forth along the highways and byways of Europe. And today the eternal wanderer is again forced to take his staff in hand and go. Not hundreds of thousands or tens of thousands, literally millions have been made homeless by Hitler's conquest of Europe; and the statesmen of those nations that still have a conscience are pondering the problem of these involuntary exiles, where to find a haven of refuge for the many fugitives from political oppression.

A bewildering variety of fantastic schemes has been hatched. The places proposed as asylums for the persecuted range all the way from the torrid jungles of Tanganyika and the Guianas to the ice-bound fields of Alaska. The more habitable sections of the globe, such as the countries of North and South America and even Palestine, the land that was promised to Jews as their national home, and which is waiting to receive the refugees, are, for political rather than economic reasons, virtually closed. Whether anything will come of the efforts of the international refugee committee, what will be the fate of the hundreds of thousands desperately and frantically seeking an escape from the tortures of régimes against which the cruelest despotisms of the Middle Ages pale into insignificance, how many will be saved and whither their trail will lead, only time can tell. Since, however, this is not the first experience of its kind within the recollection of the Jewish people, but a road that has often been traversed by Israel, might it not be useful, in order to obtain some idea of what the future may hold in store, to take a look at the past?

We will skip over all the migrations due to war. Of these other peoples have also had their share, and Jews have, therefore, no more right to complain than they. But we may concentrate on those Jewish exoduses that took place in times of tranquillity, whilst their neighbors were dwelling in security and peace and they alone were singled out for punishment. Complete expulsions of such a nature, conducted on a large scale, did not occur in Europe, notwithstanding the almost unintermittent hostility of the church, until the end of the Middle Ages, when the movements of peoples had already ceased and the tribes of invading barbarians had settled down to form the nations of today.[1] While the process of consolidation was

taking place, the situation of the Jews was on the whole at least tolerable. Their usefulness in the body politic as middlemen and as a financial power was recognized, and, however great the resentment felt and however deep the prejudices harbored against them by one element of the population, they always found their protectors in another. So long as the governmental authorities in the incipient European states were divided, the Jews were able to get along. If one prince or feudal lord decided to cast them out, there were many others ready to take them in. If the clergy preached against them, the kings or nobles, to whom they were useful, would espouse their cause and guarantee their safety. Once, however, the little principalities were unified into integral wholes and strong central governments were established, and there existed no more contending factions that they could play against one another, the Jews were, without much ado, thrown out, eliminated, and no power on earth was able to stave off their fate or prevent their doom.

This happened, strange to say, in most of those countries to which the Jew looks today for refuge. It occurred in England at the end of the thirteenth, in France during the fourteenth, and in Spain and Portugal at the end of the fifteenth century.[2] In each case the expulsion of the Children of Israel was the natural and inevitable consequence of the triumph of royal absolutism. Edward I of England, Philip Le Bel of France, Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, were, all of them, the first to bring the feudal domains of their respective kingdoms under one supreme rule. Such complete control necessitated the establishment of totalitarian states, and in totalitarian states there is no room for a dissenting, alien element like the Jews. If we accept the theory, we can understand why in countries like Italy, Germany, and Poland, Jews were able to maintain an almost uninterrupted residence until the present day, why they were not excluded from their borders as they once had been from those of England, France, and Spain. It was not that by nature the Germans, the Italians, or the Poles were more benevolent or less prejudiced than the medieval English, French, and Spaniards. The disabilities from which the Jews of Germany still suffered long after the days of Moses Mendelssohn, and the introduction by the Popes in Italy during the sixteenth century of the ghetto and censorship of Jewish books speak against such a supposition. What saved the Italian and German Jews was simply the fact that Italy and Germany had until the present not succeeded in establishing completely unified authoritarian governments. Now, however, that

such régimes have been set up, and all freedom of thought or dissenting opinion has been crushed, there is nothing left for the Jew but to go.

In short, the Jew's existence anywhere is inextricably bound up with the tolerance of variety and heterogeneity such as prevails under democratic systems of government, or governments in which all the power is not concentrated in a single person or group. Wherever such concentration has taken place, his elimination is a foregone conclusion, and there is never a dearth of excuses for casting him out once such a course has been decided upon. The annals of the past bearing upon these points read almost like modern newspaper accounts of what is now happening in Europe. For the expulsion of the Jews from England, for example, the ground had been prepared by what corresponds to the propaganda ministries of today, namely the officials of the church. Ritual murder cases, accusing Jews of using the blood of Christian children in preparing unleavened cakes for Passover, would be concocted to hound the Jews and serve for extorting money from them. The slightest misdemeanor committed by Jews, even those to which they had been driven by the government's depriving them of every means of making an honest living, was played up and most severely punished. Gentiles were also guilty of offenses like coin-clipping, but when a Jew did it, it became a capital crime. During the reign of one of the predecessors of Edward I the Jews, unable any longer to endure the cruelties to which they had been subjected, asked for permission to emigrate to more hospitable countries. Their request was refused. They had not yet been completely mulcted. Forbidden to lend money on interest, which had been their main source of livelihood, they were nevertheless expected to defray the heavy taxes imposed upon them. On one occasion, when the treasury was empty, all the Jewish heads of families in England were thrown into prison and held there until the sum demanded had been paid. Finally, in the year 1290 all professing Jews were ordered to leave England on pain of death. They were permitted to take along or dispose of only their movable property. Their real estate and synagogues, those that had not yet been confiscated, were forfeited to the royal exchequer. It is estimated that before the zero hour was reached, some sixteen thousand Jews set sail from the British Isles.

The exact fate of the exiles is not known. Many were plundered by the captains of the boats. Some lost their lives during passage. The majority of those that survived settled in France. But their

respite there was not to be long, for—note the parallel to what took place in Austria and Sudetenland with the Jews who had fled from Germany—sixteen years later the ruler of France went his English cousin one better. On one fine morning he had the representatives of all Jewish communities in his realm thrown into jail, confiscated Jewish property and accounts, and released the imprisoned only upon their solemn promise to leave the country within a month, taking along only their workaday clothes and minimum sums of money for traveling expenses. All the possessions of the Jews fell to the king, who was sorely in need of funds and who had no difficulty in trumping up excuses for justifying his high-handed conduct. The offenses announced to justify this punishment, most of which were of his own invention, included desecrating the host, sheltering Christian heretics, blaspheming the mother of God, praying aloud in the synagogues, and not wearing the yellow badge of shame.

Far more dreadful in its consequences than the expulsions from England and France, because it affected much larger numbers, was that which took place in Spain in the same year during which Columbus discovered America. The reasons alleged by the rulers of that country, who had just rid the Iberian Peninsula of the last vestige of Mohammedan power, was that the Jews exerted an evil influence upon their relatives who had been converted to Christianity, causing them to be untrue to their newly acquired faith. They did not care, these monarchs, to recall that the church itself was largely responsible for this condition, since the conversions were often the result of duress, so that the baptized in many instances had never had a chance to acquaint themselves with the tenets and beliefs of Christianity. It was most natural that they should have lapsed back into Judaism and remained in close contact with their own flesh and blood still professing their ancestral faith. Without paying attention to these obvious facts, the most Catholic Ferdinand and Isabella issued a decree in April, 1492, that by the end of July Jews of both sexes must leave the borders of Spain. During the interval they would have an opportunity to liquidate their holdings, and be permitted to take along their movable property, with the exception of gold and silver. Any Jew or Jewess who remained on Spanish soil after the allotted time would either have to accept baptism or be put to death. About two hundred thousand Jews left the country in response to this decree, fully one-half of them finding refuge in neighboring Portugal, which granted them temporary shelter at a very high price. When the period of grace was over,

all those compelled to remain for lack of funds were seized as slaves, the children being taken from their parents to be brought up in a lonely island as Christians.

The death of the Portuguese king in 1495 brought relief to the Spanish exiles, but not for long, for in the year 1497, the year before the Portuguese navigator Vasco da Gama circled Africa, an even worse fate befell the Jews of Portugal than had struck their brethren in Spain. The new sovereign, seeking the hand of the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, in order to please his bride-to-be determined to drive all Jews out of Portugal. How very modern all this sounds! To prevent the financial ruin such an exodus might occasion to his kingdom, the king tried to persuade his Jews to remain by holding out baptism as an alternative. However, the incorrigibles obstinately refused to avail themselves of this opportunity, and so, without waiting for the date fixed for their departure, Manuel ordered all Jewish children from four to twenty to be seized and forcibly baptised. Many parents preferred to die with their children rather than commit such treason against their religion. Others, however, accepted baptism in order not to be separated from their dear ones. Thus there were created in Portugal at one stroke thousands of compulsory converts. There was this difference, however, between the lot of the Portuguese and that of the Spanish Marranos. The former were given the assurance that for twenty years they would not be molested by the Inquisition. This made it possible for many who had outwardly embraced Christianity to prepare at leisure for emigration to countries where they could openly return to the faith of their fathers.

The full story of the trials of the exiles from Spain and Portugal will perhaps never be revealed. The chronicles and diaries kept by some who managed to reach havens of safety afford only furtive glimpses into what befell certain isolated groups. The rest is a matter of speculation and conjecture, based on the presence of descendants of these exiles in various parts of the world. We learn from these accounts that many of the Spanish and Portuguese Jewish refugees, especially the very old, the very young, the sick and the weak, who were unable to withstand the asperities of the journey, never reached a port. But even those lucky enough to embark had by far not come to the end of their troubles. The skippers, often cruel and savage, robbed many of their belongings and sold them into slavery, or set them ashore, after having stripped them of everything, on desert islands where they perished from

hunger. Epidemics broke out among several groups that landed in North Africa, for these, not being permitted to enter the cities, like the Polish Jews expelled by Germany before the outbreak of the present war and stranded at the Polish border, were exposed to the elements and thus fell an easy prey to disease.

There were also other difficulties that had to be contended with. It is related that when a certain contingent, that had gotten as far as Italy, arrived near Rome, their co-religionists of that city, fearful for their own livelihood, bribed the Pope not to grant the refugees permission to settle in his domains. In all fairness to Italian Jews of those days, it must be said, however, that this was not the universal rule, for generally the exiles were warmly received by their fellow-Jews and treated with brotherly generosity. Most fortunate were those who were able to reach Turkey, which was then at the height of its power and whose liberal sultans welcomed into their realm such latterly useful elements. One of them, Bajazet II,[3] is said to have expressed astonishment at the stupidity of the Spanish rulers, who ruined their kingdom by casting out the best portion of their population only to benefit the Turks. However, the road to Turkey was long and perilous, and only a fraction of those that traversed it were able to complete their journey.

Thus were the fragments of what was once a very rich, cultured, and populous Jewish community scattered to the four winds of heaven. The exodus from Spain continued for long after the expulsion, for there were many, unable to liquidate their affairs quickly enough, who outwardly embraced Christianity, while awaiting the first good opportunity to leave. Of these a not inconsiderable number subsequently found their way to Holland, where at first they were compelled to live under the mask of Catholicism. A descendant of one of these was the philosopher Benedict Spinoza. Others found a haven in England and still others in America. This accounts for the presence of Sephardic Jews in all these places.

The history of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries is replete with grim tales of Jewish wanderings. The largest wave of Jewish migration, however, in recent times was the one set in motion at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, when the brutal policy of the Czarist régime made intolerable the lot of Jews in their largest world center, Russia. One still shudders today to think of the bloody pogroms of Kiev and Kishinev, or the expulsion of the Jews from Moscow in 1891, when, in the dead of winter, with the weather many degrees below zero, people were

pulled out of bed in the middle of the night and given just a few hours to pack up and leave. The policy of the Russian government was clearly expressed by one of the most fiendish of Russian inquisitors, Pobiedonostzev, who, upon being asked what the future of Russian Jewry would be, replied, laconically: "One-third will emigrate, one-third will die out, and another third will be dissolved among the surrounding population." [4] How completely this prophecy has been fulfilled in our day! One-third of Russian Jewry did indeed emigrate to America to form the nucleus of the now populous American Jewish community, which has become the mainstay of world Jewry in this day; one-third has died out as a result of Czarist pogroms, disease, and the massacres of Petlura, Denikine and Kolchak right after the World War; while the several million that have remained in Russia will, thanks to Communist totalitarianism, soon have been completely absorbed among the other inhabitants of the Soviet Republic.

The sufferings of those Jews who had the good fortune of escaping from the Russian Gehenna, the stealing over the border without passports especially by young men sought for conscription in the army, the precariousness of the temporary sojourn in Germany, the hardships of the crossing to America in the steerage of trans-Atlantic liners, the slaving during the early years of immigration in the sweatshops of New York for a mere pittance, the torments of peddling in the towns and villages in the South and the West—all these are still remembered by some alive today. For most American Jews they constitute a chapter of the past that has long been forgotten. The wounds inflicted by Czarist cruelty have been healed. A new, young, virile community, full of life and vigor, exulting in its powers, has since grown up on American soil. And now the process has started all over again for those Jews who were not lucky enough to leave Europe betimes, or too well situated formerly to want to move.

It is evident from this review that there is nothing essentially new in the tragedy of German and other European Jewries today. There is a striking similarity between the outlook, the philosophy, the methods, and programs of the totalitarians of former and present ages. The same greed, cruelty, and sadism characterize them; and similar difficulties are experienced by the victims as they try to escape and reestablish themselves elsewhere. One can, however, also note certain important differences. The western world is not as ready to receive the fugitives from oppression, the outcast and

rejected of today, as it was for the Russian emigres of several decades ago. Baptism no longer constitutes an alternative to exile, as it did in inquisitorial Spain. Nay, even those who have been Christians for several generations are, if they have any Jewish blood flowing in their veins, hunted out and expelled by the Nazi fiends. On the other hand, however, to compensate for these disadvantages, the problem of the Jewish refugee has for the first time in history been recognized as the responsibility of civilized human society as a whole and an attempt is being made by the world to solve it.

Past experience leads one to believe that somehow or other the Jew will survive. The western hemisphere will most likely see a large influx of Jewish immigrants during the next few years, as will, undoubtedly, also Palestine. America and the Jewish national home remain the chief hope of those still dragging out a miserable existence in the lands of oppression. But while a considerable number will be saved, with the help of benevolent and sympathetic non-Jews and the superhuman efforts of their co-religionists, the doom that seems fated for the remainder is something that only a miracle of God can avert. Already a terrific price has been paid by European Jewry to the demon of Jew-hatred. The number of suicides, of those murdered in concentration camps and pogroms, of the victims of starvation and mental torture and exposure in attempting to cross the borders illegally, aside from the direct victims of war, is appalling, and before long many more, whose patience or money have given out, will have perished. And all this leaves out of account the total destruction of Jewish cultural life, the going up in smoke of synagogues, the demolition of schools and many other institutions which took years of labor and effort to build up and which can never be replaced. Such is the sad history of Jewish wanderings, the bloody imprints on the trail of humanity's perennial refugees.

UNDER THE CRESCENT

Islam is today one of the most popular religions of mankind, counting more than two hundred million devotees scattered in large groups over a territory extending from Morocco in the West all the way to China and the Philippine Islands in the East.[1] Founded some 1300 years ago by a camel-driver of Mecca, by the name of "Mohammed," the Moslem creed conquered within the first century of its birth, besides the land of its origin, a far-flung domain including Persia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypt and the whole of North Africa as well as the Iberian Peninsula. Its champions even penetrated into France as far as Tours where their advance was checked by Charles Martel. At a subsequent period Sicily and a part of southern Italy were for a while in Moslem hands; and during the sixteenth century an Islamic power, the Ottoman Turks, having made itself master of the terrain of the former Byzantine empire, swallowed up Asia Minor and the Balkan Peninsula and actually knocked at the gates of Vienna. The spread of the Moslem religion over countries which were thickly inhabited by Jews brought it about that for a good many years the majority of the Jewish population of the world lived under the crescent. It becomes, therefore, of particular interest to find out how they fared in this environment and no study of anti-semitism can be complete that does not pay some attention to the position of the Jews under Islam.

In considering this subject, it is necessary to note at the outset that Islam was never claimed by its founder to be an original creation. It was, according to him, merely a continuation of the two creeds from which it was derived. Yet it was not an exact replica of Judaism and Christianity, for it deviated from them in certain significant details. It was, therefore, inevitable that conflict should arise between the parent faiths and their offspring—and that conflict almost from the moment of the latter's birth. The development of a lively polemic literature,[2] in which Moslems took issue in their religious views with Jews and Christians, was a natural consequence. These polemics were initiated by none other than the Prophet of Allah himself [3] who, finding that he was at variance with both Judaism and Christianity and that he was on that account rejected by their adherents, felt compelled to defend his position by justify-

ing his departures from the tenets of the older creeds, and his chief alibi was that Jews and Christians had wilfully perverted the original text of the Bible of which he and he alone possessed the authentic version.[4]

Now such clashes of opinion need not necessarily be accompanied by armed warfare. The arguments of the mind do not require the reinforcement of the logic of the mailed fist. With Mohammed, however, the establishment of the authenticity of Islam was not merely a question of veracity. It was also a personal matter, something in which his honor—nay his very life—was involved. He had among his Arab fellow-countrymen bitter enemies, who not only doubted his mission but persecuted him so inexorably that he was obliged to flee from his native Mecca. As a monotheist, who revered both the old and the New Testament and spoke in the name of the God of Abraham,[5] Mohammed had counted in his plight on the recognition and support of the "peoples of the book"—under which term all non-idolators were included [6]—who were settled in and near the city of Medina, in which he had found refuge from his Meccan foes. He had reckoned especially on the aid of the powerful Jewish tribes who resided there. In this hope, however, he was destined to be sorely disappointed, for "the peoples of the book" not only refused to accept him but they taunted and mocked him, charging him with ignorance and imposture, and even conspired against him with his enemies, after having sworn friendship and peace. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that when his army was victorious, the founder of Islam wreaked vengeance upon those who, on account of proximity of belief, he had hoped would be his allies and flock to his standard and whom at first he had respected as men to whom God had revealed himself, that he punished them for their stubbornness, their hostility and their treachery by exile and, in one instance, by public massacre. The circumstance of their preponderance in numbers in northern Arabia brought it about that the majority of the unbelievers among the "peoples of the book," who felt his wrath, were Jews. Yet it would be unfair to construe Mohammed's punitive acts against the Banu Kainuka, the Banu Kuraiza and the Banu al-Nadir as a policy directed exclusively against Jews, for he employed the same methods with all those who opposed him, aye he was more severe with his Arab kinsmen who persisted in their paganism than with those who, like himself, believed in the one God even though they were foreigners.[7]

The bitterness and vituperation which the founder of the Moslem religion felt against his Jewish neighbors, especially during the last few years of his life, and which are reflected by his utterances recorded in the Koran, did not leave any marked traces on his immediate successors. The early caliphs, who were the builders of the Islamic empire, were too much preoccupied with the extension of their political power to concern themselves greatly with the beliefs of their subjects. They were too dependent on the good will of the civilized peoples whom they had conquered to risk the danger of incurring their animosity by interfering with their religious institutions, and so, if these only paid the tax and promised loyalty to the Moslem governments which gave them protection, they were left undisturbed. There was ample authority for such treatment of the adherents of other monotheistic faiths in the Koran and in the traditions of the Prophet. "There is no compulsion in religion," declares the holy book of Islam,[8] and in the *hadith* Mohammed is reported to have stated: "He who wrongs a Jew or a Christian will have myself as his indicter on the Day of Judgment."[9] The only exception to the tolerant attitude of the worldly-wise Ommayyads was that of Omar II who reigned from 717 to 720 and who, owing to pietistic influences, curtailed the rights of unbelievers in his realm.

It is first with the advent of the Abbassid dynasty towards the end of the eighth century, when the political power of Islam was already consolidated, that a less tolerant policy begins to be definitely formulated. It is then that the codes defining the restrictions pertaining to Jews and Christians which purport to go back to the second successor of Mohammed, the Caliph Omar I, emerge and that the demand is made that these rules be enforced.[10] The limitations applied to costume, mount, the carrying of arms, testimony in the law-courts, intermarriage with Moslems, the building and repair of houses of worship, publicity in the practice of religious rites and the holding of executive positions in the government.[11] Non-Moslems were to be distinguished from the devotees of Allah by the dress they wore. They were forbidden to ride on horses or mules. They were not permitted to erect new synagogues or churches, particularly in Moslem neighborhoods. They were disqualified as witnesses in lawsuits involving Moslems, etc.

This was, however, only theory. That the practice did not always correspond to it is evident from the frequent reiteration of

the ordinances which the neglect of them made necessary. But whatever the practice may have been, this much is certain: that there was no such thing as a fixed and consistent policy. Whether the laws pertaining to the "protected peoples" were enforced rigidly or loosely depended upon the character and the temperament of the sultan and the circumstances of the time. A pious ruler would, in a moment of religious remorse, dismiss all his non-Moslem officials, and a little while after, with the return of sobriety, appoint them again. This happened in the case of the Caliph al-Muqtadir, who ruled between 908 and 932.[12] There were also not wanting outbursts of popular feeling that resulted in excesses in which the Moslem population would turn upon the members of the other faiths living in their midst, destroying the latter's homes and houses of worship, massacring the men and selling the women and children into slavery. An incident of this sort occurred in Granada, Spain, on December 30, 1066, when an infuriated mob of the Moslem inhabitants of that city pounced upon their Jewish neighbors, murdering about four thousand of their number and plundering their dwellings.[13] At that time Joseph, the son of the celebrated Jewish statesman, Talmudist and poet, Samuel Ibn Nagdela, who was himself a victim of this uprising, was vizir of King Badis. What motives brought it about is indicated in the following excerpt from a poem of the *fakih* Abu Ishak of Elvira which contributed considerably to enkindling the flames of passion of the Moslem population of Granada:

"Go my messenger and relate these words to all the Sinhejites. . . . .

"Your master hath done a deed at which his ill-wishers rejoice: though he could choose a minister among believers, he hath chosen an infidel! Through this minister the Jews, contemptible outcasts, have become great lords, and their pride and arrogance know no bounds. . . . .

"I came to Granada, and there beheld the Jews reigning. They had parcelled out the provinces and the capital between them. . . . . They collected the taxes, they made good cheer, they were sumptuously clad, while your garments, oh Moslems, were old and worn out. All the secrets of the state were known to them; yet is it folly to put trust in traitors! While believers ate the bread of poverty, they dined delicately in the palace. They have supplanted you in your master's favor, oh Moslems, and will you not oppose them? . . . . Think not that it would be treachery to slay them! Nay, but treachery is it to suffer them to sit in high places. . . . ." [14]

Similar sentiments of jealousy, called forth by the favorable position of the Jews under the Fatimids, were entertained some-

what earlier by an Egyptian poet who gave vent to his feelings in such sarcastic verses as:

"The Jews of this age have attained their highest hopes and grown strong.
Power is theirs and wealth and from them is chosen the counsellor and the king.
Men of Egypt, turn Jews, I advise you. The sky has turned Jew." [15]

With all this, however, the Jews did not suffer any more from such excesses than the Christians. In fact, of the two denominations the lot of the former was by far the pleasanter under the crescent. The exilarch of the Jews enjoyed all the privileges of a secular prince while the Christian patriarch was treated only as a dignitary of the church.[16] The relative inferiority of the position of the Christians in Islamic lands may be gauged by the fact that often in times of persecution Christians would don the turban of the Jews in order to escape danger.[17] This does not mean that the Moslems as a whole did not often harbor prejudices against the Jews. Many a popular saying reveals the hostile state of mind of at least a part of the Moslem masses with regard to the Jew and their unfriendly opinion of him. "A Jew will never pay his taxes until he has his head smacked," declares one of them.[18] "Never is a Jew alone with a Moslem without planning how he may kill him," states another.[19] Again there is a Moslem tradition that "on the last day the faithful will battle with the Jews, whereupon the stones will say to the believers: 'Behind me lurks a Jew, oh Moslem, strike him dead.' " [20] It is also reported of the Jewish physician Musa that he advised his kadi on his deathbed to forbid to Jews the practice of medicine because the latter think it right to kill those who profane the Sabbath.[21] Finally it was popularly believed that foul smell was a Jewish peculiarity.[22]

It is difficult to determine how widespread these conceptions were. That in spite of them the Jews felt safer under Moslem than under Christian rule is apparent from the numerous occasions in which, when hard pressed by Christian sovereigns, they fled to the domains of Moselm rulers. The Islamic conquest of Spain from the Visigoths was equivalent to deliverance for the Jewish communities of that country and the invaders were hailed as saviors. When in 1492 Christian Spain cast out its Jewish inhabitants the majority of the exiles found refuge in a Moslem state, the Turkish empire, where they were granted numerous privileges and rose to high estate.

Of real anti-semitism of an all-embracing character one hears very little in the early history of Islam. The one major exception

was that of the fanatical Almohades, who in the middle of the twelfth century seized the reins of government in Morocco and southern Spain and who, because of their desire to establish a totalitarian state, decided to eliminate all non-Moslems, giving those that were present in their domains at the time of their conquest the choice between Islam and death, which latter alternative they later commuted to exile. It was this edict that compelled Moses Maimonides to leave his native city of Cordova. It is noteworthy that to this very day the Maghreb or western portion of North Africa, the stronghold of the Almohades, has remained a hotbed of Moslem intolerance and the center of the fiercest anti-Jewish excesses in the Moslem world.[23]

With all that the burden of Islam even under the Almohades and the Mohammedan zealots of Yemen was by no means as heavy on the pseudo-converts, who had embraced the Islamic faith for appearance's sake, as was that of Christianity upon the Marranos of Spain and Portugal. While the Inquisition exercised the strictest vigilance over the neo-Christians, punishing with the severest penalties the slightest sign of Judaizing, all that the Moslem rulers demanded was the formal verbal acquiescence in the prophetic character of Mohammed, which having been obtained, the former non-Moslem from which it was extracted was no longer molested. The attitude of Islam is well characterized by a Spanish Moslem, who had been driven out of his native land during the last expulsion of Moriscos from that country in the year 1610.

"Did our victorious ancestors," he asks those who expelled him, "ever once attempt to extirpate Christianity out of Spain when it was in their power? Did they not suffer your forefathers to enjoy the full use of their rites at the same time that they wore their chains? Is it not the absolute injunction of our Prophet, that whatsoever nation is conquered by Musalman steel, should upon the payment of a moderate annual tribute, be permitted to persevere in their own pristine persuasion, how absurd soever, or to embrace whatever belief they themselves best approved of? If there may have been some examples of forced conversion they are so rare as scarce to deserve mention, and were only attempted by men who had not the fear of God and the Prophet before their eyes, and who, in so doing, have acted directly and diametrically contrary to the holy precepts and ordinances of Islam which cannot, without sacrilege, be violated by anyone who would be held worthy of the honorable epithet of 'Musalman.' . . . . You can never produce, among us, any bloodthirsty formal tribunal, on account of different persuasions in points of faith, that anywise approaches your execrable Inquisition. Our arms, it is true, are ever open to receive all who are disposed to embrace our religion; but we

are not allowed by our sacred Alcoran to tyrannize over consciences. Our proselytes have all imaginable encouragement and have no sooner professed God's Unity and His Apostle's mission than they become one of us, without reserve; taking to wife our daughters, and being employed in posts of trust, honor and profit; we contenting ourselves with only obliging them to wear our habit and to seem true believers in outward appearance, without ever offering to examine their consciences, provided they do not openly revile or profane our religion." [24]

To sum up, then, while there were not wanting during the first few centuries of Islam instances of anti-Jewish sentiment as well as actual excesses against the Jews on the part of both the Moslem public and the government, the policy was by no means as consistent nor were the persecutions as severe on the whole or the feelings as bitter as they were in Christian countries. This was due to a variety of causes which are to be found in the nature of the Islamic religion and the constitution of the Islamic empire, in both of which respects Islam differed considerably from Christianity. The first of these was, as has been noted, the comparative tolerance on the part of Islam of other monotheistic faiths. The second was the absence in Moslem society of a strongly centralized church such as existed in the Christian world. Thirdly, the Jews were never charged by Islam, as they have been by Christianity, with having caused the death of its founder. The fourth reason for the friendlier relationship may have been the racial kinship between the Jews and the people which produced Islam. The fifth was undoubtedly the fact that the Islamic sphere of influence contained too many heterogeneous elements to be able to afford to be totalitarian. All these factors took the edge from the anti-Jewish excursions which took place within the Moslem world, in which the bulk of the Jewish population resided during the first few centuries of Islam, and made the lot of the Jew less onerous there than in lands in which the cross was supreme.

With the decline of the power of Islam the situation of the Jews in Moslem lands was not appreciably changed. Whether they were well treated or not depended to a great extent upon the economic conditions and the social and cultural niveau peculiar to each country. The rising tide of nationalism has also not been without its consequences. In Egypt, for example, the position of the Jews has been during the past few centuries and continues to be very favorable. In Yemen they are still exposed to humiliating regulations which have in recent years caused many Yemenite Jews

to emigrate. In Algiers their superior political status, the fact that they were privileged with French citizenship, a privilege that was not granted to the other natives, and their securer economic status aroused against them the ire of the Moslem population and gave rise to bloody riots.[25] In Persia Shiite fanaticism has been responsible for the coming into being of Moslem crypto-Jews who are very anxious to settle in countries where they can openly profess their adherence to Judaism.[26] The upsurge of nationalism in Turkey has been the cause of discriminatory legislation affecting Jews as well as other non-Turkish residents of that country.[27] The same holds true for Iraq. Finally, the growth of the Jewish settlement in Palestine has led to anti-Jewish disturbances. All these antagonisms, however, have nothing to do directly with the Islamic religion even though the religious factor may have been played up by those who incited the riots, as happened in the summer of 1929 in Palestine. They are due to political expediency or economic rivalry, and the opinion ventured and expressed by A. de Gobineau in 1865 still holds today that:

> If one separates religious doctrine from political necessity, which has often spoken and acted in its name, there is no religion more tolerant—one might even say more indifferent, regarding the faith of men than Islam. This organic disposition is so strong that outside of the cases where the reason of state, put into play, has led the Moslem governments to use force in order to bring about unity of religions, the completest tolerance has been the rule furnished by dogma. One must not regard instances of violence or cruelty committed on one occasion or another. If one studies the situations carefully one would clearly discover causes entirely political or grounded in human emotions and temperament. The religious factor is only invoked as a pretense but in reality remains outside.[28]

FOREARMED

The events that are taking place in the world at the present time constitute a crisis in the annals of the human race and even more so in the history of the Jewish people. It is true that Jews are not the only group that is today draining the cup of bitterness. They have many brothers in need. The Czechs, the Poles, the Norwegians, the Dutch, the Belgians, the French, the Lithuanians, Latvians, Esthonians, Greeks, Albanians, and many others are in a similar position. Yet the Jew may well ask, as the author of Lamentations did: "Behold, and see if there be any pain like unto my pain," [1] for there is no comparison between their case and that of Jewry. Whatever privations and hardships the others may presently be compelled to endure, they are merely the fortunes of war. Once the conflict is over, once the storm will have subsided and peace and quiet will reign again, their status will be normalized. Come what may, they can at least rest assured that at the worst the rank and file of them will not be driven from their homes, nor be completely exterminated by the conquerors. Quite different from theirs is the calamity that has befallen and the fate that awaits the Jew. His ailment is not only acute; it is chronic as well. Long before hostilities broke out in the fall of 1939, Jews had been given to understand by the governments of countries, which they and their ancestors had inhabited for centuries, that they were no longer wanted there. And to make their lot still more difficult, the avowed aim of the forces, that have set for themselves the goal of conquering the world, is, as far as Jewry is concerned, not mere victory but complete and ruthless extermination, the total disappearance of the Jewish stock. They have promised, in the event that they are successful, to make Europe entirely Judenrein, and in proof of the seriousness of their determination they have already, by means of forthright expulsion, starvation, torture, and cold-blooded murder, considerably decimated the Jewish population in the lands under their jurisdiction and control, aside from virtually stripping these Jews of all their earthly possessions and destroying whatever religious and cultural institutions they had built up. And these designs of the enemies of the Jewish race are not confined to the European continent alone. They extend to the entire world, to the

western as well as to the eastern hemisphere. The seeds of the poison-weed of anti-semitism have been sown everywhere so that humanity might be completely ridded of the Jewish element.

Such is the challenge that is presented to Jewry, the threat that has been hurled into the faces not only of the 9,000,000 Jews of Europe but of the still free Jewish communities of America as well. What are Jews doing to meet the challenge? How are they bracing themselves to survive the crisis? Have they the ability, the means to brave the storm, and, if so, what are they? How and in what way can and will the remnant of Israel be saved?

It would be nothing but self-deception to minimize the enormity of the problem confronting the Jew, for he is faced by powerful foes with almost unlimited resources. Nor would it do him much good to take refuge in the comforting thought that because he has managed to pull thru until now, because he has outlived so many catastrophes hitherto, he will survive this one too. The fact that a person has attained the ripe age of a hundred years is no guarantee that he will live forever. By the same token it is by no means certain that because the Jewish people has withstood all of its trials to date, it will also successfully overcome the present one. For, contrary to the popular notion, history does not repeat itself. The circumstances in every age, the disposition of forces differ, vary. Therefore, what may have worked years ago may be obsolete and useless today.

Granting all this, however, it still remains true that the current ordeal is not the first major crisis that the Jewish people has had to face. It has been put to the test before and not been found wanting. And although the factors that contributed to Jewish survival then may no longer operate today, some lessons of value might nevertheless be derived from the experiences of the past. Even if they should be unable to furnish a detailed program, they might at least suggest the general technique of escape.

The first national calamity or disaster to befall the Jewish race and give an entirely new direction to the trend of Jewish history was the conquest in the year 586 B. C. E. by the Babylonians under Nebuchadnezzar of the kingdom of Judah and the destruction in Jerusalem of the temple built by Solomon. It was a disaster of the first magnitude for Israel, this stroke on the part of the Babylonians, because nearly all Jews lived at that time within the boundaries of Palestine and because the disruption of a state accompanied by the banishment of the major portion of its population that survived the carnage and devastation of war usually meant the dis-

appearance of the conquered nation as a separate entity. When a people was defeated in battle, its protecting deities were generally believed to have fallen with it.[2]

Now if the course of events in ancient Israel would have run true to form the Babylonian triumph would have spelled the end of Judaism as well as of Jews as a people. The Jewish religion could not have survived the dissolution of the Jewish state, for the failure of Israel's God to save His followers would have been regarded as conclusive proof of His impotence, His inadequacy as a patron deity. Fortunately for them and their faith, however, the Jews had long before the blow had fallen, been conditioned to parry it. Centuries before the destruction of the first temple they had been told by their prophets and teachers that their God was no mere tribal deity, restricted in his power to one small locality. He was the God of the entire world, of all mankind, the all-powerful creator of heaven and earth, the sole provider and sustainer of the universe. Since all might and strength were His, one could not speak of His having been defeated when misfortune struck His people. On the contrary, this misfortune was of His own doing. It was He who had allowed Israel to be smitten by its enemies in punishment for its sins. But just as it was part of His divine plan to permit Israel to be vanquished by its adversaries and to be driven by them into exile, so did it lie within His power to bring Israel, when it had been sufficiently chastised for its inquities, when it had been purified and purged of its dross, back to the land of promise. And this actually happened. After fifty years of Babylonian captivity those Jewish exiles that wished to take advantage of the opportunity, were given leave by Cyrus, the conqueror of the Babylonian empire and the successor of Nebuchadnezzar, to return to the land of their fathers, to rebuild the temple and serve their God in accordance with the precepts of their hereditary faith.[3]

The Jewish people was thus granted a new lease on life, but it was a different kind of Jewish commonwealth that now arose on the ancestral soil and a different type of Jews that established it. It was no longer an independent monarchy with a military chieftain, called "king," at its head. The rule of the House of David was definitely at an end. Politically the Jewish colony in the Holy Land was under the protection and the suzerainty of the Persian empire, whose representative in Palestine kept watch over affairs and collected the taxes.[4] The Jewish settlement constituted now a theocracy, a religious community presided over by a high-priest. Its center was the rebuilt temple in Jerusalem, which became the sole

Jewish place of worship just as Israel's God was now recognized by all Jews as the only God. Monotheism was firmly intrenched. There was no more harking back to idolatry as there had been in the days of the first temple. It was a chastened, sobered, God-fearing Jewish commonwealth that now developed, a people devoted to its God and His Torah.

To this new trend, to the hold that the Torah now had on the masses, the priests, as guardians of the Torah, had contributed greatly. It was priests who had during the reign of king Josiah discovered in the temple of Jerusalem a copy of the book of the Law.[5] It was priests who served as teachers and mentors of Israel as Malachi, the last of the prophets, testifies: "For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts." [6] It was also a priest, Ezra, who brought the Torah back to Israel after it had been forgotten and taught it anew and made it popular by gathering all men, women, and children of Israel in a public assembly and reading it to them.[7]

This condition prevailed thruout the entire 600 years of the existence of the second temple. It is true that for a while Judaism was seriously challenged by the civilization of the Greeks. However, so firmly was the Jewish belief established among Jews that it was able to withstand the shock and become even stronger after the attack than it had been before. The undisputed leaders in Jewish life, who played the dominant rôle politically as well as religiously, were the priests, whose connection with the temple, the national shrine, to which pilgrims rallied every year from the most outlying regions of the diaspora—for Jews now no longer lived only in Palestine. There existed large Jewish communities in Egypt, Babylonia and Asia Minor—invested them with extraordinary prestige. For a while the chief of these priests, i.e., the high-priest, who, like Simon the Just, for example, acted as the spokesman of Jewry vis-a-vis the ruling powers and took charge of all internal affairs, for a while, after the successful Maccabean rebellion, the high-priest even assumed the rôle and title of king and ruled as an independent sovereign.[8] This lasted for about eighty years. But even after these highest Jewish ecclesiastical dignitaries were shorn again of their royal power, as a result of the subjection of the Judean state to the domination of Rome, they still exercised the highest functions of government as heads of the Sanhedrin and chiefs of the Jewish clergy.

Their rule was finally terminated when the Romans destroyed the temple, and the national service at the revered shrine, which had been entirely conducted by them and from the revenues of which they had derived their livelihood, and some of them great wealth,[9] had to be permanently suspended. Like the destruction of the first temple, so that of the second was a disastrous blow that jeopardized the continued existence of the Jewish people and its religion. To be sure the Jews were no longer in need of an independent state, as they had been during the days of the monarchy. They could live their life as Jews even in subjection to a foreign power. Had not that been their position for centuries? They did, however, require a central seat of worship, an abiding-place for the Shekinah, a spot that would be revered by all Jews and that could serve as a bond of unity among them. This they had lost. They had forfeited their temple. The national service, in which all Jews who paid their Shekel annually had had a share, was no more. The tie that had given Jews a sense of belonging together was gone. There still existed, it is true, a Jewish community in Palestine, and its head, the Patriarch or Nassi, enjoyed wide recognition.[10] But soon Palestine ceased also de facto to be the center of Jewish life, the home of the Jewish people, and all semblance of Jewish government disappeared.

Nevertheless Israel survived, survived during the almost two thousand years that have elapsed since then. Why? How? The reason was that long before the second temple had been laid in ruins and the priestly functions had to be discontinued, the ground had been prepared for this new emergency. During the very time that the priests, Israel's first teachers, were ruling over the Jewish people, there arose a body of lay scholars who instructed the Jewish masses in the knowledge of the Law,[11] and alongside the Temple of Jerusalem there sprang into being houses of worship in which sacrifices were, of course, not offered up but where prayers were recited and a novel type of ritual, consisting of instruction as well as divine communion, was developed.[12] When, therefore, the great blow fell, when the catastrophe did take place, it was able to lop off only the branches; it was not strong enough to strike at the roots of Judaism. The Torah, that was now almost universally obeyed and known by Jews, took the place of government and a national center as a bond of unity. Its teachers became the leaders of Jewish life. As for the sacrifices of the temple, a substitute was found for them in the prayers and the lessons of the synagogue.

Just before Jerusalem was about to fall into the hands of the Roman besiegers, so the Talmud characteristically relates, a Jewish sage, Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai, managed to escape thru the walls of the doomed city in order to lay the foundations of the academy of Jabneh and set up thereby the spiritual hegemony of the Torah.[13] Not long thereafter his successor Rabban Gamaliel gave the fixity to the liturgy of the synagogue by establishing a uniform order of prayers.[14] From that time on the uncrowned and yet generally recognized kings of Jewry were, as the Talmud expresses it, the rabbis,[15] and the offerings of the lips made up for the holocausts that used to be burnt on the altar of the Temple.[16]

The new structure of Jewish existence maintained itself for many years under the most varying and trying circumstances. There were times when the teaching of the Torah, that elixir of Jewish life, which alone held Jews together and enabled them to survive, was forbidden altogether and the observance of the precepts of Judaism was prohibited on the pain of death.[17] The Jews, however, managed to defy these decrees and get around them. With the utmost tenacity did they cling to their hereditary faith, risking their very lives to instruct their children in the knowledge of the Law. Rabbi Judah ben Baba, so the Talmud records, allowed himself to be riddled with spears like a sieve in order to detain a posse of Roman soldiers long enough to enable his disciples, whom he had duly ordained for Jewish leadership, to escape.[18] Rabbi Simon ben Jochai fled with his son to the desert in order to be able to continue his schooling without molestation.[19] And even when, under extreme pressure, Jews did for appearance's sake outwardly adopt his religion of their surroundings, inwardly and in the privacy of their homes they often kept alive for entire generations the traditions of their fathers.[20]

The very dispersion, the scattered nature of the Jewish people, prevented Jews from disappearing completely. If their fortunes would decline in one country, they would rise in another. If one center was destroyed, there were others that took its place. The schools of Palestine were succeeded by the great academies of Babylonia. When the Jewish community in Babylonia disintegrated, new Jewish seats of learning sprang up in Spain and Germany and France. The expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492 put an end to the hegemony of Sephardic Jewry. But when the star of this branch of the Jewish race set, that of the Ashkenazim with their center in Poland was already in the ascendancy, and so on and on.

Such was the course followed by the fortunes of Jewry until

modern times. In one way or another Judaism and the Jewish people managed to survive. But conditions have now arisen that render the methods employed hitherto ineffective, obsolete. In the present-day world, governments are of one of two patterns. They are either totalitarian or democratic, and neither of them is conducive to Jewish survival. That totalitarianism leaves no room for Jews or Judaism is, of course, obvious from the examples of Germany and Russia in this day. But democracy, too, interferes with the normal functioning of Jewish life wherever Jews constitute—and that condition exists everywhere in the diaspora—a minority. In a democratic state, in which there is no segregation and the majority rules, it is very difficult for a minority to perpetuate its peculiarities. The tendency is to conform to the common mold and the impact of the latter is inescapable. If the Jewish Sabbath is honored chiefly in the breach in modern democratic states, if Jewish learning is on the decline, if such institutions as the dietary laws are generally neglected, if intermarriage with the consequent defections from Jewish ranks is on the increase, it is due in a very considerable measure to the need which the Jew experiences in these surroundings for fitting himself into the environment. Be it as it may, for the majority of Jews in the world these matters have ceased to be problems. They find themselves stranded in countries in which their bare physical existence is no longer possible, let alone the cultivation of a spiritual life of their own. And only God knows how long and to what extent the sheltered 5,000,000, that have the good fortune of residing in lands in which they are politically, economically, and religiously free, will retain their advantages. For as long as Jews will constitute a minority in these places, they will be potentially subject to the whims of either the ruling classes or the masses, and in times of calamity be the first, because the easiest, victims of unrest. How can the evil day be staved off? How can Jews win security for themselves? How can they become masters of their fate and captains of their souls?

Again as in the past, one might say, the cure has been prepared by Providence before the blow. Long before democracy, that great leveller, rapped at the structure and totalitarianism struck at the foundations of Jewish life, Jews dreamed of a return to the land of the fathers where they would be freed from the yoke of strangers and be able to be their own masters again. On the very day, says a midrash, on which the Temple of Jerusalem was destroyed, the Messiah was born.[21] The fact itself that the Jew looked upon his sojourn outside of Palestine as GALUT, exile, indicates that the

Land of Israel has psychologically never ceased to be his home. Many indeed were the attempts made thruout the ages, since the end of the second commonwealth, by Jews with varying success to settle on the sacred soil. The major effort, however, is the one put forth in our own day. The gradual deterioration of the situation of the Jew in the countries of central and eastern Europe spurred on the birth of the Zionist movement inaugurated by Theodore Herzl, and as a result of the groundwork done by him and his successors and the ever growing Judennot, there exists today in Palestine a Yishub of more than half a million Jews that has all the makings of an autonomous Jewish commonwealth standing foursquare on its own feet.

The fate of the Jewish settlement in Palestine may at the present moment be in doubt. Much depends on the outcome of the current conflict which no one can as yet foresee. What is certain is that what the Yishub in Palestine has already, during the brief time of its existence, accomplished for the strengthening of the Jewish body as well as to buoying up of the Jewish spirit, its contribution to sheer Jewish survival on the one hand and to Jewish culture on the other, is so marked that if there will be any Jewish future at all, it will have been due to the existence of a practically self-sustaining, virtually independent Jewish community like the one that exists in Palestine today.

To sum up, then, the Jewish people is at the present time passing thru a crisis the like of which it has not experienced since the destruction of the second temple. It is literally facing extermination, extermination spiritually even if not physically. Jewish life on the European continent is to all intents and purposes non-existent, and it cannot be claimed that in America it is all that those who are concerned about Jewish survival would like it to be. Whether Jewry will come out of the ordeal unbeaten is a question that only God can answer. This much is sure, however, as something that the past has taught, namely, that if it does recover, Jewish society will be differently constituted from the way in which it is now and that the pattern it will follow will no doubt be that which has been worked out for it by the most far-sighted of its leaders in this day—that of a national renaissance in Palestine. The beginnings of the reborn Jewish state may be modest, just as was the foundation of the second commonwealth under Zerubabel or the school at Jabneh established by Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai. However, all great things proceed out of small beginnings. "And though thy beginning to be small, yet shall thy end greatly increase."

THE REBIRTH OF A PEOPLE

Although more than eighteen hundred years have rolled by since the last battle for Jewish independence was fought on the soil of Palestine and since Israel's second exile began in all earnest, the attempt made by Jews to recover their ancestral home is only four and a half decades old. In order to understand why it took Jews almost two thousand years to make up their minds to become a nation among nations again it is necessary to have a look into world history, to consider what transpired in society in general, because the Zionist movement is in a great measure the result of circumstances, the product of definite historic causes. Anti-semitism, one might say, was its mother, and the first world war its nurse. Were it not for the fact that, after having been given a taste of freedom, the emancipated Jews of Europe found themselves rejected by the gentile society in the midst of which they lived and of which they considered themselves a part, these Jews would never have thought seriously of returning to Zion. Nor would very much have come of the plans and the dreams of the founders of political Zionism if the rearrangement of the map of the world as a result of the European conflict had not rendered a Jewish Palestine a possibility. Nor can there, furthermore, be any doubt about it that without the crisis in Germany and the pressure brought to bear by their own government upon the Jews of Poland, the Yishub in Palestine would not have grown nearly as rapidly as it did. Propaganda of even the most successful kind never achieves as much as economic and political necessity. Man is a conservative creature. He hates to be disturbed, to change either his habitat or his habits. As far as most men are concerned, only extreme need will induce them to leave their familiar haunts, to forsake the land of their birth, to give up the language and the customs in which they have been reared and the institutions which they have built in order to start life anew in strange and unknown surroundings. This rule applies to Jews as well as it does to other human beings. The most intensive Zionist propaganda could not have brought half as many Jews to the Land of Israel as Kishinev and Hitler and Poland's economic boycott.

With all that, however, to say that the Zionist movement and the success of the Zionist endeavor were purely the outcome of cir-

cumstances would be equally incorrect. If anything was done about bringing to fruition the age-old dream of a return to Zion, the realization of which the position of Jews in the old world was making an urgent necessity, it was because a leader arose who gathered the scattered forces together and made them articulate. If a Balfour Declaration was issued by England in 1917, it was because there were at that time on the watch tried and experienced Jewish statesmen of the calibre of Weizmann and Sokolow who took advantage of the opportunity when it knocked and voiced the demands of the Jewish people. And if the Palestinian Jewish community was able to make the tremendous strides forward that it did during the past twenty-two years, it was because the soil of Palestine had been prepared by means of decades of preliminary work, such as the draining of swamps and the building of roads and the improvement of sanitary conditions and the opening up of new sources of livelihood, all of which made it possible for the tiny country to absorb the tens of thousands of its returning children whom the reign of terror in Germany and stifling atmosphere of Poland were driving to its shores. To be exact one must describe the Jewish national revival of the present time as a phenomenon in which man conspired with Providence, as an event which was brought about by human agents aided by circumstances that no living person was able to foresee.

All this did not happen at a single blow. Zionism did not burst into the world suddenly and without warning. Its birth, one might say, was heralded by a long pregnancy that preceded it. The colonization of Palestine by Jews, for example, was not an idea that originated in the mind of the founder of the Zionist movement, Theodore Herzl. Way back in the Middle Ages, at the time of the Crusades and of knight errantry in Europe, groups of Jews from England and France and Spain founded settlements in the Holy Land. As for plans of a Jewish state and Jewish independence, they too had been conceived by personalities with such widely differing orientations and outlooks on life as Rabbi Hirsch Kalischer, the German Jewish Socialist Moses Hess and the Russian Jewish physician Leo Pinsker, decades before the father of modern Zionism startled the world with his Judenstaat. There were, furthermore, the Chovevei Zion, groups of Jews in eastern Europe, who in the eighties of the last century already sponsored the foundation of the first modern Jewish agricultural colonies in Palestine; and last, but not least, there were Jewish philanthropists, like Sir Moses

Montefiore and Baron Edmond de Rothschild, who contributed very considerably to the building of the new Jewish Palestine.

Yet all these efforts put together could not be construed as that popular movement of the Jewish people demanding its rights from the nations of the world and aiming at the establishment of "a publicly recognized, legally secured national home" [1] on the ancestral soil of Palestine which is known as Zionism. This movement did not come into being until on the twenty-ninth of August of the year 1897 a very much assimilated Jewish correspondent of a Viennese newspaper, a journalist born in Budapest, Hungary, by the name of Theodore Herzl, convoked at Basle, Switzerland, the first Zionist Congress, the first assemblage for centuries of Jews from every part of the world to meet for the purpose of discussing their common problems and demanding from the powers that be the right to exist as an independent, sovereign nation in Palestine.

The calling together of this congress, which, so to speak, launched the ship of Zionism on the sea of international politics, was, so it is now generally conceded, entirely, from its conception unto the execution of the plan in all its details, the work of one man—Herzl. The immediate cause of its convocation was, as he informs us, the refusal of the rich Jews of the time, the Rosenwalds and Schiffs of his day, to help him by means of financial assistance to realize his scheme of creating a Jewish state in Palestine which would be the answer to the eternal Jewish question and free the Jew from misery.[2] Since the rich Jews turned a deaf ear to his proposal, the author of "the Jewish state" decided to enlist the support of the masses by convoking a congress of their elected representatives. To effect such a gathering was, however, by no means as simple as it might sound. Nay, it was an almost impossible task. It is difficult for those who are accustomed to the phenomenon of Zionist congresses, convening regularly every second year as a matter of routine and attended by duly elected delegates, to visualize the trouble that Herzl must have had in getting the first one to meet. Nowadays when a Zionist congress is to be convened, the seven or nine or eleven members of the Zionist Executive, which is a sort of Jewish Cabinet, in Palestine or London meet and decide on the place and the date. When that has been definitely settled, they notify the national offices of the Zionist organizations in the various countries. These in turn fix the dates when the election of delegates is to be held. The delegates are voted on and present themselves at the appointed time in the appointed locality and the congress takes

place. None of these instrumentalities were in existence when Herzl issued his call for the first Zionist Congress to meet in Basle. There was no World Zionist Executive to extend the invitation. There were no properly constituted Zionist groups with a clearly formulated Zionist platform to notify about the holding of elections. Instead there was bitter opposition to the entire idea of convoking a congress, not merely on the part of the assimilators who always shrank from such a positive assertion of Jewishness but even on the part of those who had been sponsoring the colonization of Jews in Palestine, the Chovevei Zion. That the assimilators should have been against such a move is, of course, easy to understand. A conference of Jews, held in the limelight of publicity and declaring before all the world that Jews are a people, would have dealt a death-blow to their contention that Jews were only a religious community and would put a weapon into the hands of the anti-semites, who had denied this claim all along by asserting that Jews *were* a nation apart. But they were not the only opponents. The so-called "Lovers of Zion" were equally antagonistic because they were afraid that, if the ultimate purpose of the Jews in colonizing Palestine were to become known, the Turkish government, the then sovereign of the Holy Land, would put a stop to Jewish immigration into that country—and herein they were not entirely mistaken either. Besides this there was resistance from the ultra-orthodox, who would not think of a return to Zion before the coming of the Messiah, and they could not conceive of the Messiah in the form of an assimilated Jewish aristocrat like Herzl.

Herzl was to learn very quickly that the opposition to his scheme was not purely theoretical, but that there were also serious practical implications. No sooner did the report get about that Munich, the capital of Bavaria, had been selected as the seat of the contemplated congress, than the Jewish community of that city protested so vigorously and brought such pressure to bear, that another site had to be chosen. None of these obstacles, however, not even the dissuasions of some of his best friends, who told him point-blank that he was crazy, were able to move Herzl. "Der Kongress findet statt" (the congress will take place) [3] was his laconic rejoinder to all their objections and admonitions. And take place it did. It opened on Sunday morning, August 29, in the concert hall of the casino of the city of Basle, Switzerland, a city situated on the Franco-German border, with one hundred ninety-seven delegates, hailing from all important Jewish centers thruout the world

and constituting the most varied group that had ever been assembled under one roof.

The sessions of this first Zionist conclave were conducted with the utmost dignity, enthusiasm and order. Herzl had seen to that. He had not waited until the last moment. Everything had been prepared weeks in advance, even the decorations in the assembly hall, for he just had to make a good impression. He did not want his congress to become the laughing-stock of the world. And it didn't. It was a tremendous success, a great moral victory for him as well as for Jewry. It demonstrated the solidarity of the Jewish people. It showed the world that Jews had not ceased to be a nation, that though scattered and dispersed to the four corners of the earth, reared under diverse conditions, tanned by many different suns, and speaking a babel of different dialects, Jews were still able to understand one another. It also proved to Herzl that his supposition had been correct, that the masses were on his side. No less than 550 telegrams of congratulation were received, and pieces of mail bearing a total of six thousand signatures, many of which were those of officers of Jewish organizations—all this in addition to petitions signed by fifty thousand Roumanian and ten thousand Galician Jews as well as greetings from prominent rabbis, such as the venerable Samuel Mohilever of Byalestok, Chief Rabbi Zadoc Kahn of France and Ruelf of Memel. With such backing, Herzl felt completely justified in laying the foundations of a permanent organization that would meet at specified times for the purpose of furthering the building of a Jewish national home. The basis of membership was to be the payment of the annual Shekel. The flag was to consist of stripes of blue in a field of white with a shield of David in the middle. Its highest authority was to be the Congress and in the interim between the meetings of the Congress an executive was to carry on the work.

The reactions to the first Zionist Congress among the Jews of the world was varied. The Jews of the East, whose position had been going from bad to worse, received the reports of its deliberations most enthusiastically. They saw in the event itself an Atchalta Digeula, a herald of redemption, the beginning of the end of their woes, the solution of the perennial Jewish problem. In the West, on the other hand, where Jews were then much more comfortably situated, the attitude was one of cold indifference, if not of actual antipathy, and Herzl had his hands full answering the stinging criticism directed against him, replying to the flood of innuendo and vituperative remarks. "Did he think he could drive

the Turks out of Palestine?" "German Jews did not look to him to redeem them," etc. And when he proposed, after the Congress was over, the establishment of a colonial bank that was to have its seat in London, he was accused of being in the service of British politics. The manner in which Herzl met these thrusts would make one believe that he was instinct with prophetic powers. With reference to the Turks, he said if nothing could be done with them, the Jews would simply have to bide their time until the crisis in the East had blown over and the "sick man of Europe" died. A people can wait. It is not like an individual. Herzl did not live to see his prediction come true, but those who survived him can testify that he had guessed correctly. In regard to the German Jews, he remarked that the day would come when they would be compelled by force to leave their fatherland. It took three and a half decades for that prognostication to be realized, but it did not fail either. As for the insinuation that he was playing politics with England, *that* was entirely unfounded. Yet it was certainly the part of wisdom to establish connections with that nation which of all the great powers had shown itself friendliest to the Jews and was most likely to play a prominent rôle in the Near East in the not too distant future.

In this way did Zionism make its entry into the world. One year after the first Zionist Congress the second was held, and a year later the third, and then the fourth and the fifth. The Zionist movement marched forward and grew. Some of the best forces in Jewry were attracted to its ranks, but the dominating figure was that of Herzl, whose magnetic personality and leadership qualities caused him to be elected president by congress after congress. It was no doubt a great honor to be recognized as a leader by Jews, each one of whom considers himself a prince in his own right.[4] But it was an honor fraught with grave responsibilities.

The problems that confronted Herzl were tremendous. There were problems from within as well as from without. It was necessary to make contacts with the powers that be. It was equally important to maintain unity within the ranks. The practical work in Palestine had to go on uninterrupted while at the same time the masses had to be kept interested in the movement. Herzl tried desperately to secure from the Turkish government a charter that would permit Jews to settle in Palestine freely and establish independent colonies in it. To render the Turks inclined to listen, he made a special trip to Palestine for the purpose of having an audi-

ence with the emperor of Germany who was known as a friend of Turkey. It was the first time in nearly two-thousand years that a Jewish leader, speaking in the name of the Jewish people, had been so bold. It created a most favorable impression in the world at large and heightened Jewish prestige immensely, but produced no practical results. On the contrary, it made the Turkish government put a clamp on Jewish immigration into Palestine, not to speak of the sale of land. This failing, Herzl evolved a scheme of helping the Sublime Porte who was always hard up for money. It took a lot of waiting, bribing of corrupt officials and maneuvering before he could reach the Sultan, who received him most courteously and decorated him. But when he finally got the Turkish ruler to agree to a charter, he was unable to raise the necessary funds that had been promised as the Jewish side of the bargain, because the rich Jews were opposed to a Jewish state.

In the intervals between his numerous journeys, which entailed considerable outlays of money and took a great deal of time from his work for his newspaper, upon which he depended for his living, the congresses were held, a colonial bank was established by means of public subscriptions to aid industrial and agricultural undertakings in Palestine, a Jewish National Fund was created for the purchase in the Land of Israel of land which would remain the property of the Jewish people, and the discipline of the movement was regulated thru the constitution of a Congress court.

To keep peace in the family was by no means an easy task. At congress after congress, as the movement expanded, the Kultur question kept coming up. A movement of national rebirth like Zionism could not content itself with money raising and politics alone. In order that it might be able to grow, it was necessary for it to educate the public, to make propaganda for its ideology, to stimulate the progress of Hebrew culture. This question of Hebrew culture was a serious bone of contention between the religious and secular elements in the movement among whom there existed fundamental differences of opinion on the matter, on which account Herzl did his utmost to keep this as well as other controversial issues from the agenda of the congresses. For four congresses he succeeded, but at the fifth the Young Zionists or the so-called Democratic Faction was able to carry its point of initiating a program of cultural activities in Palestine, and the inevitable reaction on the part of their opponents was the formation of an Orthodox wing that called itself Mizrachi and was organized for the purpose of protecting the religious interests of Jewry in Palestine.

All these trials were, however, nothing in comparison with the storm that arose at the sixth congress, held in the summer of 1903, when it was proposed to consider England's offer of the East African colony of Uganda as a site for an autonomous Jewish state. What brought this offer to the fore was the failure of all overtures with Turkey and the desperate plight of the Jews of Russia, which reached its climax in the bloody pogrom of Kishinev on Passover of 1903. The Jewish problem called for immediate solution. Palestine was still a distant dream. Something had to be done at once. When, therefore, the British government came along with its generous offer, Herzl thought that it ought to be accepted at least as a Nachtasyl, an asylum for the night. But those among the Zionists who had staked all their hopes on Palestine, which alone they regarded as the Jewish homeland, could not tolerate even the suggestion of an alternative. They called Herzl traitor. They charged him with having abandoned the Basle platform, that he had exchanged Palestine for Uganda. What was Uganda to the Jews anyhow? There were those who wept, as though Palestine had been lost a third time, and some even went as far as rending their garments in sign of mourning.

Only with the greatest difficulty did Herzl succeed in convincing the die-hards that he harbored no such intentions, and that etiquette demanded that, when an offer was made by a power like England, it be at least given polite consideration by appointing a committee to study its acceptability. The Jews could certainly not afford to lose her good will. To what consequences the matter might have led we do not know. Fortunately for Herzl as well as for Zionism, the Uganda offer had to be withdrawn, and so the Zionist movement remained whole, Herzl's prestige was saved, and Great Britain had no cause for complaint against the conduct of the Jews. Herzl had the satisfaction of seeing the ship of Zionism safely across the shallows of Uganda. But the reconciliation of his followers was the last act of his life, for on July 3, 1904, he succumbed under the weight of his burdens and the reins of office were taken over by others.

During the decade following and until the outbreak of the first world war, the history of Zionism was politically uneventful.[5] The Young Turks, who came to power in 1908 and set up a constitutional monarchy, were even more opposed to a Jewish Palestine than the Sultan had been. They looked upon such a scheme as a plot against the integrity of the Turkish empire; and if that was what the Zionists had in mind, they (the rulers of Turkey) would never

stand for it. So Zionist leaders were hard put to disavow such intentions, and they really did nothing to further the cause of political Zionism but concentrated all their energies on colonization and the fostering of Hebraic culture. They created a Palestine Development Company. They founded a national elementary and secondary school system. The latter act produced a considerable rift in the ranks, for many Orthodox Zionists, who would not have anything to do with an organization that sponsored a secularistic Hebrew educational program such as was followed by these schools, broke away to form the Agudat Israel. Those members of the religious bloc that remained could be prevailed upon to stay within the Zionist movement only by being granted permission to build schools of their own, namely the Mizrachi network of Jewish educational institutions. Another prewar schism was that brought about by the Territorialists headed by Israel Zangwill, who was in favor of accepting any territory that might be offered to Jews for settlement. When these Territorialists were overruled by the Zionist majority, they seceded completely from the Zionist Organization.

The world war was responsible for a suspension of Zionist activities, chiefly because Palestine was, so far as the political allegiance of the Jewish masses was concerned, in enemy hands. Yet it was thru it that the issuance of the Balfour Declaration was made possible which gave the movement the political guarantees necessary for the emergence of a Jewish national home, i.e., it provided the charter that Herzl had been trying to secure. The motives that prompted the British government to make this announcement were no doubt those of political expediency. To win the good-will of the Jewish people was at that time a political move of considerable advantage to the Allied side. Indirectly, however, the interests of England happened to coincide with the national aspirations of the Jewish people. The nature of the former were, therefore, of no consequence.

The man who was most instrumental in securing the Balfour Declaration was Dr. Chaim Weizmann, one of the youngest disciples of Herzl and a regular attendant of all Zionist congresses. It was Weizmann who was during the years following the first world war the dominant figure in the Zionist movement.[6] The first congress held after the cessation of hostilities elected Dr. Weizmann as president, and for ten years he continued in this position. His achievements were truly extraordinary. In the year 1921 he founded in America the Palestine Foundation Fund (Keren Hayesod), thru

which vast sums of money were collected for Palestine settlement. The pioneer movement (Chalutziut) grew apace, so that by 1925 33,000 Jewish settlers entered Palestine. The same year also witnessed the opening of the Hebrew University, the cornerstone of which had been laid by Dr. Weizmann toward the end of the war when the cannons were still roaring. In 1929, at last, thanks to his unremittant efforts, the Jewish Agency for Palestine was formed drawing new forces, those that had been outside of the Zionist camp, into Palestine reconstruction work.

During all this time things did not always run smoothly. The boom of 1925 was followed by the depression of 1926 and 1927 with its accompaniment of unemployment and consequent misery. There had also occurred several riots, and the mandatory government was far from cooperative. All these difficulties that the Jewish national rebirth encountered, however, paled into insignificance over against the jolt that the movement was to receive in the late summer of 1929. On August 23rd of that year, right after the Jewish Agency had come into being, the Jewish settlement in Palestine was subjected to a bloody attack by Arab mobs that massacred over one hundred defenseless Jews and seriously injured many others.[7] Much of the blame was attributed to the British colonial officials who had failed to take the necessary precautions notwithstanding the fact that they had been warned of the impending disaster.

Criticized by the world, the British government tried to shield its officers by shifting the responsibility for the riots on the Jews and whittling down the promises of the Balfour Declaration by means of the Passfield White Paper which was supported by the Simpson Report. The protests of the Jewish world and the rebuke of the League of Nations induced the then Prime Minister Ramsay Macdonald to write a conciliatory letter to Dr. Weizmann. But the Zionist congress, that convened in the summer of 1931, was not satisfied, and in protest against the policies of the mandatory power, refused to return Dr. Weizmann, who stood high in British favor, to the presidency, electing instead the veteran Hebrew journalist and statesman, Weizmann's diplomatic collaborator and assistant, Nachum Sokolow.

The Zionist cause had now reached its lowest ebb. Immigration to Palestine by Jews was restricted. Land was difficult to acquire. Zionist funds were decreasing both on account of the movement's loss of prestige as well as in consequence of the world depression. The most optimistic Zionists could not envisage an influx of more

than twenty-five thousand Jewish immigrants annually into the Jewish homeland, and it was calculated that on such a basis it would take at least a century before Jews would constitute a majority of the population of the Land of Israel. Many were, therefore, content with accepting as a best bet a bi-national state of Jews and Arabs.

Such was the outlook in 1931. Then the Labor Party in England fell; a friendlier spirit toward the Jewish national experiment began to manifest itself in British government circles; and when the Hitler catastrophe occurred in Germany in the year 1933, the work of rebuilding the Jewish national home received so mighty a push forward that by 1935 the number of Jewish immigrants into Palestine reached the peak of sixty thousand, and over against the unemployment crisis of the years 1926-27, there was felt an actual shortage of labor. The number of Shekel payers that were represented at the Zionist congress held that year amounted to no less than 1,200,000, which did not include the 700,000 members claimed by the Revisionists who, having been ousted from the Zionist Organization on account of the murder of the Zionist Labor Leader, Dr. Chaim Arlosoroff, in 1933, formed a party of their own.

In the year 1935, then, the stock of Zionism had reached a new high, but immediately thereafter the ticker dropped again. The exclusion from the Zionist Congress, because of the insistent demand made by the Labor majority, of the Revisionists on account of the latter's alleged complicity in the still unsolved mystery of the Arlosoroff assassination, was a blow to Jewish unity. The Ethiopian war was of no benefit to the Palestinian Jewish community either. Immigration decreased again. There was a decline in Palestine's prosperity. A run on the banks even produced a temporary panic. It was only by a miracle that the threatened introduction of a Legislative Council, which would have weakened Jewish influence over the destinies of the Jewish national home by giving the Arabs majority representation, was avoided as a result of opposition to the project in the British Parliament itself.

But even worse was now to happen. In April of 1936, encouraged by England's show of weakness with regard to Italian aggression upon Ethiopa, the anti-Jewish elements among the Arabs of Palestine, led by the Grand Mufti who owed his freedom to the clemency of the one-time Jewish High Commissioner of Palestine, Sir Herbert Samuel, began a series of well-organized and widespread riots that caused the death of several hundreds of Jews but

was aimed primarily at the destruction of Jewish property and the undermining of Jewish morale. In these two objectives, however, these attempts at undoing the achievements of Zionism in the homeland that were seconded by German and Italian agents provocateurs, who subsidized and armed the Arab cutthroats and vandals, failed ignominiously. Thanks to its better discipline and organization, which the experiences of 1929 had shown to be necessary, the Jewish settlement in Palestine was able to stand firm and maintain its position. By means of the self-sacrifice of the Jewish chauffeurs, the lines of communication between the Jewish colonies were kept open. So strong was the Jewish self-defense (Haganah) that not a single Jewish settlement was abandoned. On the contrary, new colonies were founded, the essential structures in many cases being put up overnight. The 100 per cent Jewish city of Tel Aviv, with its population of over 160,000, became independent of neighboring Jaffa thru the building of a harbor of its own for which Jews had been clamoring for years. A more diversified agricultural economy, instead of concentration on the raising of citrus fruits, made the Jewish community more self-sufficient and less dependent for its food supply on the Arab farmers. To cap it all, the arch-enemy of Palestinian Jewry, the instigator and ringleader of the riots, the Grand Mufti, was eliminated from the scene by being exiled.

For all the havoc that had been wrought by the state of unrest which lasted for nearly three years—and the damage done to Jewish property was considerable—Jewry was more securely and firmly intrenched in its ancestral home than it had been since the destruction of the second temple. There was danger for a while, to be sure, after the publication of the report of the Royal Commission in 1937, of a still further curtailment of the area reserved for Jewish settlement by partitioning the tiny country into Jewish and Arab sections. The proposal, on which Jewish forces were very much divided, was, however, shelved. Instead a so-called round-table conference between Jews and Arabs was to take place in London in the spring of 1939 at which the contending groups were to meet face to face in order to iron out their differences. Actually this never happened. The meeting, which had been sponsored by the Chamberlain government of appeasers, was merely used as an excuse for issuing another white paper for the purpose of freezing the Jewish settlement in Palestine. These plans were upset by the outbreak of the second world war which is now in its fourth year.

Like its predecessor, the present war is interfering seriously with

the normal progress of the Jewish national revival. The closing of the Mediterranean to all commercial traffic has brought immigration into Palestine to a virtual standstill. Hitler's victories on the European continent have put an end to Zionist activities in any shape or form among the eight million Jewish victims that have fallen under his sway. The citrus industry, upon which the Yishub depended chiefly for its livelihood, has been deprived of most of its markets. The principal cities of the Holy Land, notably Tel Aviv and Haifa, have already suffered more than one air raid involving the loss of human life and property. These indubitable setbacks have been partially offset by the disappearance of open friction between Jews and Arabs, by the establishment of war industries which provide work for workers who had lost their jobs on account of the war, and also by Palestine's increasing self-sufficiency in the matter of food, most of which used to be imported from other countries prior to the war.

The future of the Jewish national home as well as of all Zionist endeavor is bound up to a great extent with the outcome, at present still obscure, of the present conflict and the fate of the British empire to which Palestine is intimately linked. Just what that fate will be is, of course, unpredictable. What is certain, however, is that when the war will be over and the Allies should prove to be victorious, the rôle of the Jewish national home in affording a haven of refuge to the uprooted Jewish masses of Europe will loom larger than ever and the need for the speedy realization of Herzl's dream of an independent Jewish state on the soil of Palestine will seem more urgent that it has been at any time theretofore.

THE HOLY CITIES OF THE HOLY LAND

To millions of Jews the world over the little strip of seacoast and hill country on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean between Egypt and Syria is today the land of Jewish hopes and dreams. To religious Jewry Palestine is more than that. It always has been and still is the Holy Land, ground hallowed by divine election and the sacred memories of Israel's past. The sanctity of Eretz Israel is a fundamental doctrine of Jewish religious law having important legal implications. The actual expression of "holy *land*" as applied to the land of Israel may occur but once in the Bible, and that once in the writings of one of the latest prophets.[1] Nevertheless there can be no doubt about the place of distinction that Eretz Israel occupied in the framework of Judaism from the very beginning of Jewish history. It is characterized in the book of Deuteronomy [2] as a "land inquired after by God, upon which the eyes of the Eternal are constantly fixed," and the Mishnah in Kelim [3] explicitly states that "the land of Israel is the holiest of all countries (of the world)."

The sacred character of the Jewish homeland is marked in Jewish religious tradition by the attachment to its very soil of certain distinctive laws which are not operative elsewhere. These include such regulations as those pertaining to the heave-offerings to the priests and the tithes, the sabbatical year and the jubilee, as well as the rites bound up with the temple, like sacrifices, purification ceremonies and allied matters. There is even recorded an occasion on which, for what appear to have been political considerations, Jewish religious authorities declared the earth of countries outside of Palestine to be ritually unclean,[4] which had the force of an embargo on the importation of foreign manufactures or articles of food into the land of Israel.

The exact extent of the territory to which these specific rulings have reference is, to be sure, a moot question in the Talmud, some authorities holding that they pertain to the entire area that had been conquered by the Israelites during their first occupation of the promised land that began under Joshua, on the theory that the original sanctification of Eretz Israel had never been annulled.[5] Others again are of the opinion that these distinctive laws apply only to the more limited territory of which the Jews took possession

when they returned from their Babylonian exile under Ezra and Nehemiah. It is also a point of controversy whether after the destruction of the second temple, when Jews no longer constituted the majority of the population of Palestine, the requirement of setting aside the heave-offering for the priests still possessed the force of a biblical enactment or whether it was only a rabbinic ordinance.[6] But whatever the legal status of Eretz Israel at the present time may be, whether the special precepts governing it became obsolete with the loss of Jewish sovereignty over it or not, sentimentally it never lost its sacred character for the Jewish people. Holy places, our sages remark, cannot be stripped of their sanctity, for has it not been said: "And I shall make your sanctuaries desolate," [7] which implies that even in their ruined state they retain their sacred character.[8]

This quality of holiness inheres in the whole of Palestine. Eretz Israel possesses as a country greater sanctity than other parts of the human world. And wherein was this demonstrated? In the fact, replies the Mishnah,[9] that the Omer and the first-fruits and the shew-bread deposited at the temple could be derived only from the products of the soil of Palestine. While, however, the whole of Palestine is terra sancta, certain spots in it enjoy a higher degree of sanctity and reverence than others on account of the part they have played in the history and the religious experiences of the Jewish people. Among these hallowed places of the Holy Land the forefront is occupied today by the "four holy cities" that have survived down to our own time and each of which may be said to have played the predominant rôle in the Jewish life of Palestine in one of the four millennia of Jewish history.

The first of these four holy cities in point of time is Hebron, the burial-place of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and of their wives Sarah, Rebecca, and Leah. Hebron is reputed to be one of the oldest cities of the world in existence, having been built, according to the tradition of the Bible, seven years before Tanis of Egypt,[10] which has already disappeared from the face of the earth. Its original name was Kiriath Arba,[11] "the city of the four." At the time of the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt it was inhabited by a race of giants, the "children of Anak," [12] in comparison with whom the spies sent out by Moses seemed to themselves like grasshoppers.[13] Hebron's greatness fell out during the first of the four thousand years of Jewish history, the formative period in which the patriarchal family developed into a nation. It seems to have already been an important urban center when Father Abraham came

to Canaan. It was there, among other places, that he pitched his tent [14] and in it that he purchased from its Hittite owners thru Ephron, their spokesman, the Cave of Machpelah in order to bury in it his deceased wife, the matriarch Sarah,[15] and to be laid to rest in it afterwards himself.[16] High up in the mountains of southern Palestine, about three thousand feet above sea level,[17] and having therefore a healthful climate, Hebron was a favorite haunt of the patriarchs, all of whom are reported to have sojourned there for various lengths of time.[18]

When the Israelites invaded Canaan under the lead of Joshua, Hebron was in the hands of an Amorite prince.[19] It was conquered by Caleb, the son of Jephuneh of the tribe of Judah, and consequently fell to his lot.[20] However, when the land was divided by Joshua, the city itself was designated as one of the cities of refuge for accidental murderers in western Palestine,[21] in which levitical priests, descendants of Aaron, of the family of Kehath, settled,[22] whilst Caleb retained the surrounding fields and villages.[23] It was only natural that, when a king was chosen from the tribe of Judah, he should make Hebron his capital. That actually happened when, upon Saul's death, David, the son of Jesse, was anointed as king over Judah.[24] David established his royal residence at Hebron and reigned from there for seven and a half years [25] until he became king of all Israel, whereupon he removed to Jerusalem,[26] which thenceforth became the capital of the land of Israel and the official abode of subsequent Jewish rulers.

From then on Hebron played a rather minor rôle, although it was still considered important enough for Absalom, the son of David, to organize his rebellion against his father there,[27] and for Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, to fortify it.[28] Completely abandoned by its Jewish inhabitants when Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon conquered the kingdom of Judah, it was resettled by Jews in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah.[29] At the time of the Maccabees Hebron was inhabited by Idumeans, descendants of Esau, who, pressed by the Arabs, had penetrated into southern Palestine from their mountain retreat Seir in the South.[30] Judas Maccabeus reconquered it and it remained in Jewish hands until the time of the destruction of the second temple, when it was completely destroyed by Vespasian.[31] It was rebuilt after the Mohammedan conquest, which took place in the 7th century C. E., by the Arabs, who revered in Abraham the father of their ancestor Ishmael and called the city after him Al-Khalil (i.e., The Friend).[32] It was ruined, probably by the Mongolians, before the Crusaders built it up again at the

beginning of the twelfth century C. E. From the hands of the Christians it was wrested once more by the Seljuk Sultan Saladin in 1187 C. E. and from then on until the riots of 1929 Hebron has always had a considerable Jewish population.[33] While the Jewish traveler Benjamin of Tudela, who visited the Holy Land towards the end of the twelfth century, does not speak of any Jews as living in Hebron,[34] Rabbi Isaac Cheilo reports the existence there in the fourteenth century of a good-sized Jewish community. Its number were appreciably augmented at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries by exiles from Spain.[35] Later on there was an influx of Ashkenazic Jews.[36] In 1915 the Jewish population of Hebron was computed at about two thousand souls out of a total of over twenty thousand inhabitants.[37] Since 1929 it has become too dangerous for Jews to live there.

The chief place of interest for Jews in Hebron is the Cave of Machpelah, the burial-place of the patriarchs. The cave itself, which is permanently sealed, is surrounded by a sacred enclosure (Haram) containing a Mohammedan mosque and the cenotaphs. This sacred enclosure, the wall of which has a base of Herodian architecture of the time of the second temple and a medieval Arab superstructure,[38] is forbidden for non-Moslems to enter. Jews are permitted to go only up to the seventh step leading to the entrance into the courtyard.

The decline of Hebron coincides, as it has been seen, with the rise of Jerusalem as the metropolis of Jewish Palestine, a rank which the latter maintained, except for the brief interruption of the Babylonian exile, for a full thousand years from the time when David made it his capital until the destruction of the second temple by the Romans, i.e., the period of Jewish sovereignty. In point of sanctity, Jerusalem, as the site of the central sanctuary during the first and the second Jewish commonwealths, holds the first place above all other cities of Palestine, that is to say the portion within the city wall—which in antiquity did not correspond to the present wall surrounding the Old City which was built about four hundred years ago by the Turkish Sultan Soliman the Magnificant.[39] The walled towns of Palestine in general enjoyed, according to the Mishnah, a distinction above others therein that persons afflicted with leprosy could not remain within the city walls.[40] Jerusalem had, however, the added privilege of being the only place in which the fruit of the second tithe as well as the flesh of sacrificial animals of lighter sanctity was permitted to be eaten.[41] But that was not all. Within Jerusalem itself there was a section that was esteemed

holier than any other part. That was Mount Moriah, the hill on which the temple stood. Of Mount Moriah, again, the portion within the enclosure, known as the Hel, was more sacred than what was outside of it, being closed to non-Jews as well as to Jews who had become defiled thru contact with corpses. Still more restricted was the courtyard for the women within this enclosure. One step higher was the so-called courtyard of the Israelites, which was limited to men. Above it was the courtyard of the priests, whither no Jew not of priestly rank durst enter except for certain rites connected with the sacrifices. Then came the vestibule, then the temple, and finally the holy of holies which contained the ark with the tablets and which even the high-priest could enter but once a year on the Day of Atonement when he made expiation for the Jewish people.[42]

Like Hebron, Jerusalem is a very old city. It is said to have already existed in the time of the patriarch Abraham, who after his victory over the four foreign kings was blessed by a certain Malkizedek, king of Salem,[43] which is identified with Jerusalem. Afterwards it was ruled for a while by representatives of the Egyptian Pharaohs. These seem to have had a great deal of contention with the natives, who eventually seized the power from them.[44] When the Israelites entered Canaan with Joshua, Jerusalem had an Amorite king.[45] While, however, other cities were quickly reduced by the invaders, Jerusalem, which was inhabited by a tribe known as the Jebussites, although surrounded on all sides by Israelites, managed to hold out until it was conquered by David, who drove out its erstwhile inhabitants [46] and bought from Arawnah, the Jebussite, the threshing-floor on Mount Moriah [47] which became the site of the temple that was erected by his son Solomon.[48]

The choice of Jerusalem as the capital of his realm bears eloquent testimony to the military genius of David, for the city is admirably situated for strategic purposes. The hills upon which it stands constitute a natural fortress, making it well-nigh impregnable. The wisdom of the selection was proven by the experience of subsequent years, because for nearly four centuries, amidst varying vicissitudes, Jerusalem remained in the hands of the Davidic dynasty. It survived the attack in the days of Rehoboam, son of Solomon, by Shishak, king of Egypt.[49] It withstood successfully the siege of the redoubtable Sennacherib,[50] having been rendered self-sufficient by King Hezekiah, who had a tunnel constructed that diverted the water of the Gihon Spring into the city.[51] Nebuchadnezzar, the destroyer of the first temple, beleaguered the city no less than a year and a half before he could capture it,[52] and even

the Roman legions that destroyed the second temple some six hundred years later were able to take it only after a long-protracted war.[53]

The erection in it by Solomon of the central sanctuary made Jerusalem not only the political but also the religious center of Jewish Palestine. It was a city of priests and prophets and administrators and teachers. On the altar of the temple sacrifices were offered up daily for practically a millennium. These were purchased by means of the shekels that were contributed annually by every Jew.[54] Thither on the three pilgrimage festivals Jewish pilgrims from all over the world would repair [55] to present their offerings in accordance with the biblical injunction "Three times a year shall every male man of thee appear before the Lord thy God." [56] Priests and Levites had their abode in it.[57] Prophets like Isaiah and Jeremiah preached their matchless sermons in it. Teachers like Ezra and Simon ben Shetach and Hillel and Shammai taught in its schools and academies. The Jewish Supreme Court, the Sanhedrin, had its seat in the Hewn-Stone Chamber in the complex of buildings in the temple area.[58] It was a busy, humming city the praises of which were sung by friend and foe alike. Particularly touching are the accounts given of it by the Alexandrian Jewish philosopher Philo, who flourished at the beginning of the common era, and in the pseudepigraphical Letter of Aristeas, which dates from at least a century earlier.

With the destruction of the second temple, although it retained the affections and the veneration of the Jewish people, Jerusalem lost its position of actual leadership in Jewish life. Jews continued to pray near the remains of the Western Wall, the Kotel Ma'arabi, which is all that is left of the magnificent structure of the temple built by Herod, the most sacred Jewish shrine in all the world, whenever they were permitted. We say "permitted" because for at least five hundred years that elapsed between the reign of the Roman emperor Hadrian and the Mohammedan conquest in the seventh century they were virtually not allowed to go near the place.[59] However, the center of Jewish life was elsewhere, and although in our own day, and especially since the nineteenth century, Jerusalem has again had a substantial Jewish population, aye a clear Jewish majority,[60] and although many prominent Jewish religious and the most important Jewish national institutions are located there, and the cemetery on the Mount of Olives and the tombs of kings and priests of the Hasmonean and Herodian periods and other such landmarks which are among the oldest historic

monuments of the Jewish people are found in it,[61] Jerusalem cannot yet claim the first place among the Jewish communities in the world from the standpoint of population or influence.

When the Romans drew a ploughshare over Jerusalem and turned the Holy City into a heathen town which they named Aelia Capitolina and into which Jews were refused admittance,[62] the Sanhedrin of Jewish scholars, in which was vested all that was left of Jewish authority, passed thru a long period of peregrinations, holding its sessions now in Jabne, now in Usha, and again in Shefar'am, Beth She'arim, and Sepphoris, until at the end of the patriarchate of Rabbi Judah, the Patriarch, the redactor of the Mishnah, it found a place of repose in the city of Tiberias on the shores of the Lake of Galilee.[63] This city which played the leading rôle in the Jewish life of Palestine from then on until about the end of the first millennium of the common era, was built roughly speaking fifty years before the destruction of the second temple by Herod Antipas, a son of Herod the Great, and named after the latter's friend, the Roman emperor Tiberius.[64] Situated in the vicinity of natural hot springs possessing healing properties and favored as a winter resort on account of its warm climate due to its low altitude, Tiberias was at first shunned by the scrupulous among the Jews because human bones were discovered within its limits and the city was therefore declared unclean.[65] The celebrated Tannaite Rabbi Simon ben Jochai succeeded, however, in determining and marking the sites of the graves and thus making the city fit for habitation by the pious, as a result of which it rapidly became a Jewish religious and cultural center. Rabbi Jochanan Napacha, a pupil of Rabbi Judah, the Patriarch, established his academy there, and so the Palestinian Talmud was both cultivated and redacted in it. St. Jerome, the Christian church-father of the fourth century of the common era, who translated the Bible into Latin, i.e., the author of the famous Vulgata, obtained his knowledge of Hebrew from Jewish masters living there. The earliest payetanim, whose activity can be traced back to the sixth century, as well as the compilers of the oldest agadic midrashim probably had their home in it.[66] At the beginning of the seventh century Tiberias was the center of an insurrection of Palestinian Jews against their oppressive Byzantine masters, which contributed considerably to the defeat of the latter at the hands of the Persians.[67] The spiritual hegemony of Tiberias continued even after the Mohammedan conquest which opened up Jerusalen to Jews again and permitted the transfer to the Holy City of the academy and the gaonate,[68] for in the tenth

century it was the seat of the Massorites and the place in which was invented the now most prevalent system of Hebrew vocalization that is known as the Tiberian.[69] The crusades administered the death-blow to the then existing Jewish community of Tiberias and not until comparatively modern times did the city again acquire an appreciable Jewish population. The attempt on the part of the Turkish Jewish nobleman Don Joseph Nassi towards the end of the sixteenth century to rebuild the then ruined city and make of it a self-sustaining Jewish colony and industrial center proved abortive.[70] Today despite its hot springs and other advantages, Tiberias, which is reputed to be the site of the graves of Moses Maimonides, Rabban Jochanan ben Zakkai, Rabbi Akiba, and Rabbi Meir and other Jewish notables, reveals nothing of its pristine glory. Although the majority of its eight thousand inhabitants are Jewish, it does not seem to have much of a future, as most of these Jewish residents belong to the old Yishub, that immigrated during the nineteenth century, and are maintained chiefly by the Chalukkah.[71]

The youngest of the four holy cities of Palestine, Safed, is also the northernmost. Perched high on the verdant hills of Galilee and commanding a magnificent view of the country below Safed, the city of Kabbalists with its pure bracing air conducive to the exaltation of the spirit, was completely unknown before the time of the crusades. Its name does occur in the Palestinian Talmud [72] in connection with the bonfires kindled on the mountain-tops to announce the new-moon. But it is not at all certain whether that Sefath was identical with the modern Safed. The first definite indication of the existence of a Jewish community in Safed is the report of an excursion by a local rabbi to the city of Tiberias during the generation following the death of Moses Maimonides for the purpose of pronouncing a ban against all those who would dare to condemn the writings of that great Jewish sage.[73] From then on the star of Safed looms ever brighter upon the horizon of Jewish Palestine so that by the end of the sixteenth century it practically dominates the scene, outstripping in population and influence and wealth even the Jewish community of Jerusalem.[74]

The meteoric rise of the Jewish community of Safed commencing with the beginning of the sixteenth century was, like the sudden upspurt of the modern Yishub, due chiefly to two political events of far-reaching importance. One was the expulsion of the Jews from a large Jewish center—in this case Spain. The other was the conquest of Palestine by a powerful and liberal nation—this time the Ottoman Turks. The first was responsible for the migration of a

considerable number of Jews of means to the Holy Land. The latter made possible their settlement and development there under favorable conditions. The early Turkish sultans were enlightened rulers and the Turkish empire at the height of its power and prestige. Thanks to its healthful climate, its fertile surroundings, and the good communications with Damascus, as well as its freedom from Christian and Moslem fanaticism from which cities like Jerusalem suffered, Safed attracted a large number of Jewish settlers, who established themselves there and prospered. Life was not easy to be sure, any more than it is in modern Palestine. "There is no room in Safed," writes an Italian Jewish visitor to his folks at home, "for anyone who has no capital or is not strong enough to engage in some trade." [75]

However, it was not by its material prosperity, important as that undoubtedly must have been as a contributing factor, but by its spiritual wealth that sixteenth-century Safed distinguished itself, and that caused its fame and influence to be spread all over the Jewish world. It was a city not only of merchants and tradesmen but also of scholars and saints. Rarely had such a galaxy of really outstanding personalities been gathered together in one place as they were in Safed in the sixteenth century. There were among the ten thousand souls that constituted the Jewish population of the city, which boasted no less than twenty-one synagogues and eighteen schools, such incomparable rabbinical authorities as Jacob Berab, who came near reviving the practice of ordination and thus restoring the Sanhedrin, and as Joseph Caro, the author of the Shulchan Aruk which became the basic code of traditional Judaism. There were preachers like Moses Alsheich; poets like Solomon Alkabetz, the composer of the hymn "Lekha Dodi" that is now recited on Sabbath eve at all synagogues, and like Israel Najara who wrote the touching Aramaic poem recited at the Sabbath table of "Yah Ribbon Alam"; and kabbalists like Isaac Luriah, Chayim Vital, Moses Cordovero and hosts of others. Such practices as the midnight vigils in mourning over the destruction of the temple (Tikkun Chatzoth) and the tikkunim of Shabuoth and Hoshana Rabba eve and the Yom Kippur ritual originated in Safed. It is related of one of its saints that he would go about at midnight thru the streets of the city knocking at every door to rouse the householders from their sleep with the exhortation: "Jews, God's holy flock, wake up to serve your master," and before long the synagogues would be teeming with worshippers and the voice of prayer would be heard from every quarter.

A great deal of fasting and praying and mortifying of the flesh was done in sixteenth century Safed. But life was not composed only of sadness. One day of the week at least was always a day of joy. That was the Sabbath. It was greeted like a bride by a bridegroom. On Friday afternoon long before sunset the Safed kabbalists, their bodies cleansed by ablutions and clad in white, would go out into the fields to receive "Queen Sabbath," which is the theme of the hymn of Lekha Dodi. At the table at home special hymns (Zemiroth), many of them composed by Safed's own poets, would be sung. Special significance was attached to the third meal (Shalosh S'udoth) served between the afternoon and the evening prayers, and finally after vesper service the festivities of the Sabbath day were protracted by a banquet to accompany the queen at her departure with song and good cheer.[76]

For two whole centuries Safed's sun shone brightly, its rays illuminating the entire Jewish world. The writings of its teachers and preachers and legists, printed by its presses of which the first was established as early as the year 1563, being the first printing press in the entire Near East, were disseminated far and wide. Its customs and practices attained universal vogue among Jews. Since then, however, its light became gradually dimmed in consequence of a series of misfortunes that followed one another in quick succession. Rapacious officials, undeterred by a weak central government, brought about thru onerous taxation the impoverishment of the once prosperous community. Two earthquakes, one in 1769, the other in 1837, and several plagues caused the death of the greater part of the Jewish population. The city suffered also at the beginning of the nineteenth century from pillage by the Druzes. After the earthquake of 1837 all the synagogues had to be rebuilt, so that there is now no house of worship extant from before that date. Despite all these catastrophes, Safed boasted shortly before the first world war a Jewish population of well over ten thousand souls.[77] The world war reduced their number to three thousand[78] and the riots of 1929, which took a large toll among the Jews of Safed, who live largely by the Chalukkah, caused a still further decline. There does not seem to be any prospect at the present moment of a revival of the glories of this city that was once full of romance and religious fervor. Nothing but memories remain, but they are sacred memories, memories that will live forever, for they have become part and parcel of the ideology and the history of an eternal deathless people.

THE BOOK

"And what great nation is there, that hath statutes and ordinances so righteous as all this law?"

Deuteronomy 4, 8

"This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night . . . ."

Joshua 1, 8

IT SOLD MORE COPIES THAN "GONE WITH THE WIND" [1]

In his popular history of human art entitled "The Arts," a tome some 677 pages thick, the well-known Dutch-American journalist and historian, Hendrik Willem Van Loon, devotes no more than two short paragraphs to the artistic contributions of the Jewish race. He describes the Jews as a people without any art of its own which has nevertheless for a period of two thousand years influenced the entire art of the western world. The means whereby they exerted this influence was "a book. But it happened to be the Book of Books," the Bible.

Just what it was that made the Hebrew Scriptures the most widely read book in the world, maintaining its place as a best-seller for almost twenty centuries, with a circulation in the year 1939, the year in which the present world war began, of no less than twenty-six million copies, still puzzles many persons. Numerous attempts have been made to reveal the secret of its popularity, but perhaps the best explanation of its success, the most comprehensive and complete, is that which is suggested at the end of the fifth chapter of the "Chapters of the Fathers." [2] I have reference to the statement attributed to Ben Bag Bag of "Turn it over and over, for everything is in it." This must not be taken to mean, as it would seem to imply, that one could find every sort of information in the Bible, that it might serve as a source-book of science, or a manual of engineering or other such purposes. The end for which the Bible is all-sufficient is human conduct. It is the most perfect guide for man's behavior toward God and fellowman. That is the reason for the deep impression it has made on the human mind.

It is not difficult to recognize some of the factors that were responsible for the Bible's impinging itself upon the human consciousness, for the fascination it has exercised on the imaginations of millions of men. Two of them that can readily be singled out are the psychological insight and the human interest of Bible narratives. Where in literature can one find a more touching scene, painted in a few bold strokes of the pen, than that in which Joseph, the erstwhile shepherd's son, who had become the viceroy of a mighty state, made himself known to his brethren who had sold him into

slavery?[3] Where has there been depicted a nobler, more self-effacing friendship than that which existed between David and Jonathan, a friendship for which even the forfeiture of a throne was not too great a sacrifice?[4] Are you looking for the model of a perfect host, the very embodiment of hospitality, one who attends to every detail of the comfort of his guests? You have him in Abraham as he entertained the three angels.[5] Note how he urges them, once they had passed it by, to stop at his humble abode; how he asks them to rest and refresh themselves under the shade of the tree; how he promises them a frugal repast and serves them a sumptuous banquet, himself standing up and ministering to them whilst they were reclining. Do you seek an instance of conjugal fidelity, of a loyalty so strong and powerful as to survive even the grave? You see it exemplified in the demeanor of Ruth, the Moabitess, who out of faithfulness to the memory of a deceased husband, from whom she had had no children, clings to his aged mother and even adopts the latter's God and people in order to be able always to remain with her.[6]

What lends these Bible stories their power, what renders them so effective, what has preserved their freshness, what has kept them from growing stale, so that even today, after the lapse of millennia, they still seem up-to-date is their simplicity, their lack of artificiality and affectation, and the perennial, universal truths that they preach. The friction between Kain and Abel,[7] between Jacob and Esau,[8] between Joseph and his brethren,[9] this sort of brotherly strife is something that could arise in any family, at any time, and in any place. Rivalry among women, such as that which prevailed between the matriarch Sarah and her bondswoman Hagar,[10] or between Rachel and her sister Leah,[11] has not ceased to be a motif of human conduct. Most men are still weak in the face of temptation like their progenitor Adam.[12] Korah may be dead, but the "sons of Korah," as Scripture assures us, the spiritual descendants of that insincere, wily politician, they who, in order to further their own selfish ambitions, do not shrink from the most dastardly act but stand ready at all times to betray their people, aye their closest friends, these children of Korah "have not died."[13] And aren't there in our midst in this day and age doting parents, like Israel's forefather Isaac, who are blind to their children's faults,[14] and spoiled children, like Absalom, the son of David, who turned against his own father in order to deprive the latter of his throne?[15] And isn't the contest for power with all the attendant cruelties as fierce today as it has ever been before? Thus we can go thru the Bible,

pointing to instance after instance, each of which constitutes in and by itself a reason for why this book has stood the test of the ages and survived until this day.

But the Bible does not consist exclusively of narratives, such as the account of the creation of the world and of the early generations of man,[16] of Israel's forbears,[17] of the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt [18] and the conquest of Canaan [19] and the fortunes of the Jewish people during the days of the first commonwealth [20] and the beginnings of the second.[21] And by the way, although these accounts are important sources for the annals of the Jewish race in particular as well as mankind in general, they do not represent pure history, the object of which is information, nor simply belles lettres, the aim of which is to entertain or amuse the reader. The Bible is a book with a definite Tendenz. The Bible stories give the impression of having been carefully selected on account of the lessons they contain and the morals they point. Thus, for example, in the book of Judges one comes repeatedly across the observation, whenever the Israelites were in distress, that their misfortunes had been brought on by the sins they had committed against God and the worship of idols, wherefore the Lord had delivered them into the hands of their enemies.[22] However, as soon as they repented of their evil ways and returned to God with a contrite heart, they were redeemed again from the hands of their oppressors. Now the Bible, let us emphasize it once more, does not consist exclusively of such narratives. Fully one-half of it is comprised of other genres of writing, of legal codes and sermons, of parables and prayers, and of what must for want of a better name be designated as "wisdom literature."

In each of these types the Bible excels. There is nothing like them among the literary production of the human race. The revolutionary character of the laws of Israel's Torah, the difference between them and the ordinances of the other nations of antiquity, was already pointed out by the lawgiver Moses himself. "What great nation is there," he asks, "that hath statutes and ordinances as righteous as all this Law?" [23] And this statement was no idle boast or exaggeration, for the teachings of the Hebrew Scriptures introduced something new into human society, something that had not existed before. The world to which the Torah was brought was a world of narrow nationalisms, of tribal loyalties. It was a world that was made only for natives and in which the stranger was hated and despised. To the ancient Greeks, for example, any-

body who was not of Hellenic blood and speech was a barbarian and as such not deserving of consideration, not privileged to claim the right belonging unto men. Along came the Jewish Torah and laid down the love of the stranger as a cardinal principle of social ethics. "Ye shall love the stranger, for strangers have ye been in the land of Egypt." [24]

The civilization of the age of the Exodus was one that was built on slavery. Its achievements were the result of the sweat and the toil of human beings who were treated like chattel, of the exploitation of men by their fellows. The famous pyramids of Egypt, those huge mausolea of the Pharaohs, that are listed among the Seven Wonders of the world, are estimated to have cost hundreds of thousands of human lives and could be erected only by means of slave labor because no freeman could be induced of his own volition to undertake the gruelling task that their construction must have been in an age in which machinery was practically unknown. Now along came Judaism and forbade slavery among Jews altogether. No Israelite might enslave his brother. "They are *My* servants whom I have led out from Egypt." [25] As for non-Jewish slaves, it was ordained that they be treated with consideration and humaneness, and be given their freedom if they suffered, even though it be of pure accident, the loss of a single limb or organ, even though it be no more than a tooth.[26] Furthermore, festivals were instituted as a reminder of Israel's deliverance from slavery—"a remembrance of the exodus from Egypt." [27] Nay more, every seventh day of the week was proclaimed as a Sabbath, a day of complete rest, on which not only human beings, including the most menial domestics, but even mute beasts were to desist from their regular weekday labors.[28] The purpose of this all was that men might be saved from the engrossing effect that uninterrupted toil had on the soul of the slave, as it is clearly stated in the version of the Decalogue that is found in Deuteronomy: "In order that thy servant . . . . may rest like thyself, for thou shalt remember that thou wast a slave in the land of Egypt . . . . therefore does the Lord thy God command thee to observe the Sabbath day." [29]

Altogether the Jewish institution of the Sabbath, which was for a long time a much misunderstood innovation in civilized society, gave human existence a new dignity and worth. It enabled man to free himself from the daily grind. It afforded him an opportunity for thought and contemplation.[30] It made him aware of the operation in the world of spiritual as well as material forces, and thus strengthened the belief, which Judaism was the first religion to teach and

popularize, that the universe was a united whole, created by one God, who is its lord and master as well as its sustainer and provider. When one reads passages of the legal sections of the Pentateuch, such as chapters 19 and 20 of the book of Leviticus, one notes the anxiety on the part of this new system of living to rid men of the debasing superstitions that were connected with and inherent in the idolatrous worship of many gods. Judaism's aim was to make the life of its adherents holy. That is why it prescribed for them such disciplines as the dietary laws [31] and the rules of what was permitted and what was forbidden in the matter of marital relationships.[32] Do not defile yourselves, it cautioned its followers, with the abominations that were practiced by the peoples of Egypt and Canaan, who permitted the marriage of brothers and sisters and other close blood relations and whom the earth spewed forth on account of their perversions.[33]

This is the philosophy that the Torah preaches. But above all does one sense in this fundamental source of Jewish law the cry for justice. "Justice, justice shalt thou pursue," [34] justice in the law-courts, justice in business, justice in the relations between employer and employee. "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment!" [35] All shall be equal before the law, "the stranger as well as the native" [36] There must be no favoritism, no taking of bribes, no distinction between rich and poor, noble or ignoble,[37] as existed among other peoples with their system of castes and classes. This prohibition of unrighteousness is applied to meteyards, weights and measures. "Just balances, just weights, a just ephah and a just hin shall ye have." [38] It is sinful to steal and deceive [39] or oppress [40] a fellowman, nor is it lawful to take advantage of another's helplessness and inferior position. "Do not put a stumbling-block before the blind." [41] "Do not maltreat an orphan or a widow," [42] nor "keep a workingman's hire overnight." [43]

To this attempt to right the wrongs of human society, an attempt which has even today not yet been carried out successfully, mighty impetus was given by the prophets of Israel, the first and greatest social reformers perhaps of the human race, whose thunderous plea on behalf of the underprivileged reverberates thru the ages and whose indictment of social ills and exposure of sham and hypocrisy is as pertinent today as it was over twenty-five hundred years ago.

Take, for instance, the stinging words of rebuke with which Isaiah castigates his contemporaries who, while bringing their oblations to the Temple, were committing all sorts of crimes without:

"To what purpose to me is the multitude of your sacrifices? . . . . I am full of burnt-offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts. . . . . Your new-moons and appointed seasons my soul hateth. . . . . Even when ye spread out your palms . . . . for prayer, I hear not, for your hands are filled with blood. Wash ye, make ye clean, ... cease to do evil, learn to do well, seek justice, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." [44] Or hear how he flays corruption in government in the passage: "Thy princes are backsliders and companions of thieves. Every one loveth bribes and followeth after rewards. They judge not the fatherless, neither doth the cause of the widow come nigh unto them." [45]

Mankind may have progressed in the fields of science and technology, but no essential changes have as yet been wrought thereby in human nature. The social evils of yore continue to afflict the society of man, and just as it still does today, so then, too, a large share of the responsibility for them rested on the shoulders of the fair sex. They were due in no small measure to the demands made by the wives of the well-to-do upon their husbands who, in order to gratify the wishes of their women-folks, committed all sorts of crimes against those who were beholden unto them and subjected to their will. And so we find a prophet like Amos calling the ladies of the upper classes to task in the following immortal sentences: "Hear this word, oh ye fat cows of Bashan, that are on the mountains of Samariah, that oppress the poor, that crush the needy, that say unto their lords: 'Bring, that we may feast.' " [46]

One can infer even from these few quotations that the prophets of Israel were not mere dreamers or behind-the-oven recluses, naive individuals who did not know what was going on about them. They were, on the contrary, men of the world, persons endowed with breadth of vision, who saw far beyond their own time and their diminutive country. They were statesmen, diplomats; and, although they were idealists, they were idealists of a practical kind. A prophet like Isaiah, for instance, who, notwithstanding the fact that he belonged to the upper brackets of society and conversed with the king on a plane of equality,[47] nevertheless identified himself with the cause of the downtrodden and the oppressed, this Isaiah was acquainted with every detail of the ladies' fashions of his day. Read chapter three of the book that bears his name, in which he pours out his venom on the haughty daughters of Zion, and you will find enumerated there no less than twenty-four articles of women's dress, many of which can no longer be identified. Jeremiah, again, that sad

prophet who had predicted and witnessed the destruction of the first temple, warned the public against allowing themselves to be led astray by the appeasers of the age that cried: "Peace! peace!" when there was no peace.[48] All the prophets had at one time or another cautioned Israel against reliance upon the might of arms or upon the promises of allies that were no more dependable than "a broken reed." [49] "Assyria will not help us," said Hosea. "Upon (Egyptian) horses (the tanks of the time) we shall not ride (to victory), nor shall we anymore call the works of our hands our gods." [50] Yes, all the countries of the civilized world came within the purview of these inspired seers, who were the first to envisage an era of universal peace, when "nation would no longer lift a sword against nation, nor practice anymore for war," [51] but "the wolf and the lamb" [52] would live peaceably side by side.

Now the prophets of Israel were not merely destructive critics; they were also constructive teachers. They did not only perform surgical operations; they also administered therapy. If they were unsparing in castigating their people's vices, they compensated therefor by comforting it in its sorrows and mitigating its grief. And God knows there was much need for such solace, for evil days came upon Israel, crisis succeeded crisis, and it was only thanks to the inner moral strength built up by these God-inspired comforters that Israel was able to survive. There is nothing more tender, more refreshing and soothing than the balmly words of consolation that one reads in the second part of Isaiah, such as, "Comfort ye, comfort ye My people, saith your God. Bid Jerusalem take heart and proclaim unto her that her time of service is accomplished, that her guilt is paid off, that she hath received at the hand of the Lord double for all her sins"; [53] or "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger of good tidings that announces peace, the harbinger of good tidings that announces salvation, that says unto Zion: 'Thy God reigneth! Hark, thy watchmen! They lift up their voice. Together they sing, for they shall see eye to eye the Lord returning unto Zion. Break forth into joy, sing together ye waste places of Jerusalem. For the Lord hath comforted His people. He hath redeemed Jerusalem." [54] Nor is there anything more rousing and stirring than Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones coming to life again.[55]

This faith that the prophets preached to the nation to buoy up its drooping spirit was fostered also by another type of scriptural literature, by that most remarkable collection of the outpourings of the

human soul that has been accepted as its prayer-book by half the world, the psalms. There is nothing in literature that can compare with them in depth of feeling or grandeur of expression. The themes of these psalms are many and varied. Some of them, like psalm 118, voice national confidence. "All nations encompass me about; verily in the name of the Lord I will cut them off . . . ." [56] Others, like the oft-quoted 23rd psalm, are expressive of individual trust in God. "Even when I walk thru the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil for Thou art with me." [57] How brave are these words, how comforting when uttered by a human being at a time of bereavement when he has been parted from those dearest to him in all the world and he has no one left to sustain him in his loneliness but God! There are psalms that give vent to the anguish of the soul in distress like the one that contains the verse that is said to have been recited by the Savior of Christendom during his passion: "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" [58] There are those, again, that celebrate the wonders of nature, like the one which begins with the declaration of "The heavens declare the glory of God," [59] and which has been incorporated into the Sabbath and holiday liturgy of the synagogue, or the 104th that is said by Orthodox Jews on every newmoon. There are psalms that constitute hymns of gratitude, like the oft-repeated 145th, and the 95th—"Come, let us sing unto the Lord; let us shout for joy to the Rock of our salvation," [60] with which the ritual of ushering in the Sabbath begins. There are also psalms that recall Israel's past glory like some of the "songs of ascent." [61] And finally there are the didactic psalms, that serve as a sort of spiritual exercise of edification and moral upbuilding. "Lord, who may sojourn in Thy tabernacle? Who may dwell upon Thy holy mountain?" [62] asks one of these. And the answer it gives is: "He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh truth in his heart."

And this takes us to the type of scriptural literature that we have mentioned last, the wisdom literature of the Bible of which the two outstanding representatives among the books sanctioned by canon are those of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. The method employed by these two works for teaching virtue is not that of narratives illustrating the good life, nor that of precepts of the permissible and the forbidden, nor that of impassioned denunciations or fiery exhortations, but rather the simple, straightforward statement of the truth or the employment of the parable. Their main emphasis is on such virtues as prudence, temperance, thrift, humility, honesty, and

conjugal fidelity. "A soft word turneth away wrath, but a grievous word stirreth up anger," counsels the Proverbist in one place.[63] In another he excoriates: "Go to the ant thou sluggard, consider her ways and be wise, which having no chief, overseer or ruler, provideth her bread in the summer and gathereth her food in the winter." [64] Again, using a different rhetorical device, he says: "There are six things which the Lord hateth, yea seven that are an abomination unto him: haughty eyes, a lying tongue, a heart that deviseth wicked thoughts, feet that are swift in running to evil, a false witness that breatheth out lies, and he that soweth discord among his brethren." [65]

Woman also comes in for her share in this literature. Among the types depicted there is the cantankerous, quarrelsome wife, of whom the Preacher remarked: "And I find woman to be more bitter than death." [66] There is also the frivolous, faithless kind, the philanderer that must eventually come to grief, whose lascivious ways are so graphically described in the seventh chapter of Proverbs. Finally, there is "the woman of valor, whose price is far above rubies, in whom the heart of her husband can repose complete confidence." [67] This is the type the Proverbist had in mind when he exclaimed: "Whoso findeth a wife findeth a great good, and obtaineth favor of the Lord." [68]

It is obviously impossible within the bounds of one brief essay to call attention to all the beauties and riches of the Bible. The few examples presented, however, should suffice to indicate some of the more important reasons for its continued popularity and to explain why, after having been in the world market for nearly two thousand years, it still sells many more copies annually than even so eminently successful a novel as Margaret Mitchell's "Gone With The Wind."

THE KING'S ENGLISH

It has long been a commonplace among students of European history that one of the chief props of modern Western civilization, where it still exists, is the religious lore than emanated from Judea. If the nations of Europe have grown and prospered during the past two thousand years, this has been due in very large measure to the part played in their lives by the ethics of the Jewish Bible; and to the extent to which this influence is today waning is their welfare being jeopardized. This observation concerning the share that the Hebrew Scriptures have had in molding the characters of European peoples and in the development of their own cultures is not an idle boast. There is hardly a literature of the Occident that has not felt the stimulation and that has not been enriched by the thought content of the Old along with that of the New Testament. Several present-day European languages owe their literary form to the translations made into them of the books of Jewish Sacred Writ. The only written records left of the idiom of the Goths, first of the Teutonic tribes to appear on the horizon of history, are renderings into that dialect of parts of the Bible, to produce which the translators had to invent a special alphabet.[1] The Germans had no prose literature to speak of until Luther published his famous translation of the Holy Scriptures.[2] The earliest Anglo-Saxon verses, those of Caedmon in the seventh century [3] were, as reported by the Venerable Bede, paraphrases of "Genesis and Exodus and other histories of holy writ." One of the two oldest specimens of Polish prose is the Psalter of Saint Florian, and Russian literature was non-existent before the introduction of Christianity, which is an avowed offspring of Judaism.[4]

It is, then, by no means an exaggeration to assert that there is no important literature in the Western world today that is not in one way or another indebted to the Jewish Holy Writings. Yet among all modern languages and literatures there is none in which their influence has been more deeply felt and their effects more far-reaching than the English. "There is no . . . . important literature," write Messrs. Gannett and Gosse in their History of English Literature, recently published by the Macmillan Company,[5] "so largely indebted as the English to a collection of writings in a foreign language, produced under circumstances exceedingly dissimilar

to any that ever existed in England. . . . . Were it possible to eliminate from British literature whatever it owes to the Bible, the residuum would be like the shorn and parcelled (river) Oxus in comparison with the 'majestic stream that flowed, brimming, bright, and large.' " Vice versa, if "the Bible could be erased from the consciousness of" the English-speaking "peoples, it would forfeit well-nigh half its influence over the world," which is due to "the reverence for it . . . . of England and the nations closely allied to her in blood." The English language has been repaid for this service, these authors go on to say, "by an elevation, a picturesqueness, and an affluence of beautiful sentiments which confer on the literatures of these peoples a great advantage over those which . . . . have been more or less debarred from this treasury of grandeur." "All modern nations," they conclude, "have borrowed more or less from the Scriptures, and been more or less influenced by them . . . . ; but the Northern nations alone, and more particularly the British, have so thoroughly assimilated them that they seem to have naturalized (the Jewish) patriarchs and prophets as their own countrymen."

It would be a very interesting inquiry for psychologists to determine what it was in the make-up of the English people to attract it so powerfully to the Jewish Scriptures. But whatever the explanation, the fact remains, as Messrs. Gannett and Gosse put it, that the Bible in its English rendering "is one of the two supreme glories of English literature" [6] the other being the works of the greatest of modern poets and playwrights, William Shakespeare. And if we accept the testimony of the Encyclopedia Britannica, the former enjoyed, for a long time at least, far greater popularity and vogue than the latter. "Before the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth (that golden age of English literature which produced a Shakespeare and a Milton and a Spencer)," declares that authority, "the Bible had become and for most of the seventeenth century it remained the one book familiar to every Englishman. It was read in churches and read at home; and everywhere its words, as they fell on ears not deadened by custom, kindled a startling enthusiasm." [7] The Puritans, for example, those most typical of all Protestants, who may properly be regarded as the fathers of the United States of America, accepted every word of it literally as the word of God and recognized a close resemblance between their own fortunes and those of Israel of old. And so it was also with other groups.

The deep impression made by the Bible not only upon the minds of the common people but even upon the intellectual leaders is evi-

denced by the contents of such literary masterpieces as Milton's "Paradise Lost" and Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress." But it was not ideas alone, processes of thought, that the Bible set agoing. The very phraseology of the English language, as noted previously, was affected by it. This was clearly perceived by Joseph Addison, one of the foremost English essayists of the beginning of the eighteenth century and regarded by many as perhaps the greatest master of English prose. "There is," he writes in one of the issues of his *Spectator,*[8] "a certain coldness and indifference in the phrases of our European languages, when they are compared with the Oriental forms of speech; and it happens very luckily, that the Hebrew idioms run into the English tongue with a particular grace and beauty. Our language has received innumerable elegances and improvements from that infusion of Hebraisms which are derived to it out of the poetical passages in holy writ . . . . How cold and dead does a prayer appear that is composed in the most elegant and polite forms of speech, which are natural to our tongue, when it is not heightened by that solemnity of phrase, which may be drawn from the sacred writings. It has been said by some of the ancients, that if the gods were to talk with men, they would certainly speak in Plato's style, but I think we may say, with justice, that when mortals converse with their Creator, they cannot do it in as proper a style as that of the Holy Scriptures."

Now wherein could this influence of the Bible on English speech of which Addison speaks best be detected by the layman? Certainly not in the matter of vocabulary, for in that respect a tongue like the German reveals, ironically enough, far deeper imprints than English; while the words of Hebrew origin that have been incorporated in the English language are few and far between—one can think offhand only of such terms as *"cherub"* and *"seraph"*—the number of vocables of Hebrew derivation that have become naturalized in German speech is quite considerable. Such expressions as *"Schlemiehl," "meschugge," "Schächter," "mechulle,"* and *"Pleite machen"*[9] have an honored place in the German dictionaries.

It is not, then, in the use of Hebrew terminology that the impact of the Hebrew Scriptures on the English language is revealed. It manifests itself rather in the realms of style and syntax, in the figures of speech and the idioms that have become part and parcel of common usage. Dr. William Rosenau, in his "Hebraisms in the Authorized Version," has collected a large number of biblical proverbs and similes that have become indigenous in the everyday parlance of English-speaking peoples. The list is too lengthy to be re-

produced here in its entirety. The following examples may, however, be cited for the sake of illustration:

"in the sweat of thy face" [10]
"am I my brother's keeper?" [11]
"the fat of the land" [12]
"a land flowing with milk and honey" [13]
"the apple of his eye" [14]
"the way of all the earth" [15]
"the people arose as one man" [16]
"a man after his own heart" [17]
"how are the mighty fallen." [18]
"a proverb and a byword" [19]
"with the skin of my teeth" [20]
"from strength to strength" [21]
"vanity of vanities" [22]
"as a drop of a bucket." [23]

It is a matter of common knowledge that Abraham Lincoln, whose speeches are studied as models of conciseness and vividness of expression, owed his terse and simple eloquence chiefly to his mastery of the Holy Scriptures. And it is no wonder that he should have been impressed with the language of Sacred Writ when the foremost classics of English literature exhibit unmistakable traces of it. Thus we find Shakespeare, in Twelfth Night,[24] employing instead of the word "family" the scriptural locution, "father's house," [25] and in The Winter's Tale [26] for "merriment" the phrase "a merry heart," [27] while in King Richard III [28] he speaks of the "Lord's anointed" [29] in referring to the king, and describes a mighty man as "a tower of strength" [30] the very figure used in the Book of Samuel.[31] Likewise do Milton's "Paradise Lost," Gray's "Elegy," Pope's "Essay on Man," the essays of Bacon, Macaulay, Disraeli, Carlisle, Ruskin and Emerson, and other masterpieces of the English language abound in scriptural phraseology.[32]

In short, the King's English is full of the Bible at every turn, so much so that, were one to attempt to weed it out, one might as well do away with the English language altogether. And as to "the King's English," while we do not know exactly how that phrase originated, we have a strong suspicion that it may have some connection with the translation of the Holy Scriptures sponsored by King James I, known commonly as "the Authorized Version," concerning which Professor R. G. Moulton of the University of Chicago has said: "Their style has largely leavened the style of modern English, their thought has become so closely inter-

woven with English thought of the last three centuries that it is impossible to sever the two." [33]

There is a fascinating story behind the official English translation of Israel's book of books, which has until this very day remained the standard text used by the Anglican church, a story that reminds one very much of the circumstances that surrounded the first written rendering of the Hebrew Bible into another tongue. I refer to the so-called Septuagint, the translation of the Holy Scriptures into Greek. According to rabbinic tradition [34] as well as extra-rabbinic sources [35] this translation enjoyed the patronage of, even if it was not actually effected by, a royal Maecenas, one of the first Ptolemies of Egypt. It was not the work of one man but the joint achievement of many scholars, who collaborated in it and gave it their approval. Also—and this is one of the oft-noted characteristics of the Septuagint—it adhered very closely to the original Hebrew text, being so literal at times as to do violence to the Greek idiom. Now the self-same procedure was followed in the production of the English Authorized Version of the Bible. It, too, had a king, James I, as its chief sponsor. Like its Greek predecessor it was the result of the labor of many savants who were drafted for the task. As in the case of the Greek version, again, the collaborators in this English translation conferred on every important question that arose in the course of their work. Also like the Septuagint, King James' Bible, while it took account of all earlier English translations of the Holy Scriptures, beginning with that of Wycliff (who was, together with his contemporary Chaucer, the father of modern English), it adhered as closely as possible to the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. This literalism was indeed one of the rules that the translators were bidden to observe most scrupulously.[36] The consequence was a version of the Holy Scriptures that constituted a veritable revolution in English syntax and style, for in the Hebrew of the Bible there are but few abstract terms, and hardly any subordination of one clause to another. Instead clauses are generally simply strung together by means of the copulas "and" and "then," which must be handled most skillfully if they are not to produce monotony.[37] For the sake of illustration let us take a certain passage from the Book of Esther. In ordinary idiomatic English it would read something like this:

"When Mordecai ascertained all that had happened, he rent his clothes, put on sackcloth (and covered his head) with ashes. Then he went through the city crying loud and bitterly."

This is rendered in the Authorized Version as follows:

"When Mordecai *perceived* all that *was done, Mordecai* rent his clothes, *and* put on sackcloth and ashes, *and* went out *into the midst* of the city *and* cried *with a loud and bitter cry.*"

To be absolutely candid one would have to admit that the constructions in the latter rendering are not at all English, that the Authorized Version is a sort of Hebrew English, if you please, not the English of England. And yet no one seemed to take offense at its apparent barbarisms. On the contrary, it was this style which was thenceforward recognized as classic and revered for its dignity and grace. Said that eminent English jurist of the early 17th century, who was also an outstanding Orientalist and Bible scholar, John Selden: "There is no book translated as the Bible for the purpose. If I translate a French book into English, I turn it into English phrase, not into French English. I say 'It is cold,' not 'It makes cold,' but the Bible is rather translated into English words than into English phrase. The Hebraisms are kept and the phrase of that language is kept." [38]

It is well at a time such as the present, in which fate has thrown together the lots of the Jewish and the English peoples, to call attention to these intimate cultural ties that have for several centuries existed between these two groups. Perhaps it is not mere chance that Israel should in this war of civilization against savagery be on the side of the British lion. There is after all more in common between them than coinciding political interests. There exists, to be sure, no evidence to substantiate the claim that the English are the descendants of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel. That, however, the Torah that Moses once brought to the offspring of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, has become the heritage of the English-speaking peoples, is true beyond cavil of a doubt. This may account for the fact that the countries in which English is spoken constitute today the most congenial milieu for the people that gave the Bible to the world.

THE SCROLL AND THE CROSS

The religion of Israel is, even according to the most radical view, several thousands of years old. It would be utterly impossible within the limited framework of a brief essay to describe adequately an edifice which it took millennia to build. One may perhaps succeed in coining slogans that may sum up in one sentence the essence of the faith, its basic, underlying principle, but there is no such shortcut to the formulation of the individual applications of this principle or to all that has been thought or said or written about it. The Talmud relates an anecdote about a would-be-convert to Judaism who applied to the sage Hillel, an older contemporary of the founder of Christianity, with the request that he teach him the Torah whilst he was standing on one foot.[1] Hillel, who was blessed with a sense of humor, took him up on this rather unreasonable assignment and made him repeat after him the maxim: "What is hateful to thee do not do to thy neighbor," which was nothing else than the golden rule of "Love thy neighbor as thyself," first found in the book of Leviticus,[2] put negatively. "This," added the Jewish sage, "is the essence of the Law. The rest is commentary." However, in order to understand the essence it is necessary to study the commentary. Therefore, "go learn." The same, we must warn the reader, holds true here also. The best that we can offer for the purpose of our discussion is a few highlights. To grasp their full significance and obtain a clear picture of the nature of Judaism he must study further.

We shall not be dilatory any longer but immediately proceed to answering the question of "what is Judaism?" Many persons, particularly non-Jews, are under the impression that Judaism is merely another name for the Mosaic faith as laid down in the Pentateuch. This is only a part of the truth. It is true, to be sure, that the Five Books of Moses are the basis of the Jewish religion, but to say that the contents of the former are equivalent to the latter would be like asserting that the root or stem of a tree is the whole tree. It cannot be disputed that Judaism as it is now constituted would have been impossible without the foundation that was laid at Sinai some 3500 years ago. Yet the creed that the Jew, even the most traditional, professes today is not simply the religion of

the Pentateuch, but an unfolding, an outgrowth if you will, of the same.

Let us, for the sake of the clarification of what we mean, cite a few illustrations. One of the most important outward manifestations of Jewish belief today are the prayers of the synagogue, which are pronounced three times every day and are considered by Jewish law not as voluntary acts but as an obligation upon every Jew who is to be regarded as complying with the requirements of his faith.[3] These prayers, without which traditional Judaism would be almost unthinkable, are, even according to the most conservative opinion, an innovation of later times. They came into being for the most part more than a thousand years after the revelation at Sinai. Not a word is mentioned about them in the Bible. There is not even as much as a hint in the Five Books of Moses about three daily services to be held in the synagogue.

Again, take the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, which is one of the fundamental teachings of Judaism and was included in the thirteen articles of the faith of Moses Maimonides that were at one time accepted as authoritative by all classes of Jews. Although one read the Old Testament from cover to cover, one would not find a single direct or even indirect reference to this concept.

The Judaism of today cannot, then, really be fully equated with the Jewish religion as it appeared in the time of Moses. It started therewith, to be sure, but it has since undergone some modification. Traditional Judaism as it presents itself to us is rather to be compared to a geological formation consisting of several superimposed strata. The lowest layer, comprising about 60% of the total represents the biblical period which extended approximately from the year 1400 to the year 400 B.C.E. The second, making up about 30% of the whole, is an accumulation of the rabbinic era, which is the name that may be given to the millennium that began in 400 B.C.E. and ended in 600 C.E. The third and last stratum, which constitutes no more than one tenth of the entire bulk, hails from the Middle Ages and is the increment that was added by the Jewish philosophers of that time. We shall not go into a detailed analysis or description of the various stages in the development or evolution of present-day Judaism, but content ourselves with merely a rough sketch of it by calling attention to what it has in common with its daughter faith, Christianity, and in what essentials it differs from it.

That a close affinity exists between Judaism and Christianity goes without saying, since the latter is definitely known to have been a direct descendant of the former, a plant that has its roots in Jewish soil and ideology. The Savior of Christendom, whatever his real nature may have been, led, according to the New Testament, the life of a Jew.[4] The older gospels quote him as declaring that he had not come to change a single iota of the Law of Moses.[5] It was only with respect to the question as to whether the Messiah had already or whether he had not yet come that his personal creed, that of primitive Christianity, which accepted Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ (the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew Messiah), was differentiated from that of the majority of his Jewish contemporaries. Christianity, furthermore, shares with Judaism, as a part of its spiritual legacy, the Old Testament and a goodly portion of Old Testament morality, also the belief in one God, and such doctrines as those concerning the immortality of the soul, the world to come, and paradise and hell. Many of its institutions are either modelled upon or borrowed from Jewish prototypes. Among these may be listed:

a) *the church,* which has its counterpart in the synagogue; (In fact, the Greek word for church, ecclesia, is almost identical with the Hebrew term for synagogue, BET HAKKENESET.)

b) *the Lord's prayer,* the constituent elements of which are found in the Talmud;[6]

c) *baptism,* which is nothing else than the Jewish ritual bath which was required to be taken by all those who wished to enter the Jewish fold prior to their official admission;[7]

d) *the Eucharist,* which has its basis in the Passover meal, the wafers being derived from the MATZOT[8] and the wine from the four cups of this beverage, the ARBA' KOSSOT, prescribed for the Passover eve home ritual;[9]

e) *the Sabbath,* which was at first observed on the seventh day of the week as it was by the Jews;[10]

f) holidays like *Easter* and *Pentecost,* which almost coincide chronologically with Passover and the Feast of Weeks;[11]

g) the *vestments* of the pope and the higher clergy, which follow more or less the priestly robes of the Aaronides who served in the Temple of Jerusalem;[12]

h) the *Gregorian chant,* which reveals extraordinary similarities to the oldest music of the synagogue, namely the cantillation of the Holy Scriptures.[13]

Yet for all the resemblances between them and their organic connection, the two faiths are in many respects widely divergent.

They vary even in the very essentials that they seem to possess in common. It is true that Christianity reverences the Pentateuch just as Judaism does, but whereas for Judaism the laws of Moses are still valid in their essence, because the Torah given by God cannot be changed,[14] Christianity professes the belief in a new dispensation that has caused these laws to be superseded.[15] It is not only in their attitude toward the validity of such ritual commandments as those pertaining to the observance of the Sabbath, the festivals, the dietary regulations and other institutions still operative among Jews today that Judaism and Christianity differ, but also in their ethical philosophy and their moral theory. To the law of retaliation of the Old Testament, for instance—and let it be noted that that law was never literally carried out at least by Pharisaic Judaism, which interpreted the principle of "an eye for an eye" [16] to connote nothing more than claim of compensation for the loss of an eye [17]—the New Testament opposes the rule of turning the other cheek.[18] Whereas Judaism holds as punishable only actual carnal relationship between those whose union is forbidden, the view of the founder of Christianity, as reported in the Gospel, is that the mere thought of such an act already constitutes adultery.[19] Not that such intent is not considered morally reprehensible by Judaism,[20] but inasmuch as adultery is a legal concept and the law has jurisdiction only over overt actions—it cannot judge men's thoughts [21]—therefore only the breach of the moral code by deed is subject to punishment. And herein is revealed the fundamental difference of character between Judaism and Christianity. Judaism stresses action, works, deeds. It is the performance of the commandments that makes men meritorious and produces salvation. "God wished to make Israel worthy," declared one of the Jewish sages of old, "therefore did He give them a copious Torah and many commandments." [22] Not that intentions are not important, but good intentions that are not translated into good deeds are of but little value.[23] Christianity, on the other hand, regards intention as primary. It is the spirit, not the letter, that counts.[24] It is belief—belief in the Savior—that renders blessed and brings about salvation.[25]

These phenomena are not accidental. They are grounded in the intrinsic natures of the two religions. They are due to the fact that Christianity centers about a personality whereas Judaism revolves about an abstract law. The perfect Christian is he who leads the life of Christ. His ideal is Imitatio Dei. The perfect Jew is he who obeys the Torah. The Jewish ideal is the fulfillment of

God's precepts. It is interesting to note how the varying natures of the two faiths are borne out by their chief symbols. The most sacred object of the Christian is the crucifix, the sign of Christ. The holiest possession of the Jew, on the other hand, is the scroll of the Law.

The differences of character between the two creeds, to which attention has been called, are also responsible for their divergent conceptions of God. Judaism, which has as its basis an abstract law, worships as the Supreme Being an abstract God. He may have had personal relations with Israel's ancestors and known Moses face to face.[26] Yet He has never been seen by mortal man or revealed Himself in the flesh. Being an abstraction, not lodged in a human or any other physical form, He could not be conceived of as possessing a multiple nature. Abstract essences or qualities are always simple. There is only one justice, goodness, beauty, etc. Christianity, on the other hand, having as its fountain-head a personality, could very well think of God as having once been incarnate and as being of a threefold nature, i.e., as consisting of three persons in one.

Now the question may be asked: "Why did Christianity, which is a direct descendant of Judaism, give up the Law and put in its place the belief in a personality? How is the idea of a new dispensation to be reconciled with the declaration of the Savior himself that he had not come to change a single iota of the Law?" The answer is that Christianity in the form which it assumed under the influence of the apostle Paul was really an accommodation of Judaism to the needs and the views of those of its followers who were not of the Jewish race. And here is the reason why such an accommodation appeared necessary. Hereditary Judaism, notwithstanding its broad, humanitarian interests and its universalist outlook—the God of the prophets was, even the most radical Bible critics will agree, the God of all the world—as essentially a national religion, one intimately bound up with the experiences of a specific people living in a particular locality. It was to this people, that regarded itself as the "seed elected," that the Law was given at Sinai.[27] It was with the children of Abraham that the covenant of circumcision had been established.[28] The festivals that the adherents of the Torah of Moses were to observe bore nearly all of them a Jewish national character, celebrating some memorable event in the history of the Jewish people, such as, the exodus from Egypt which is recalled by Passover,[29] and the receiving of the Torah at Sinai

which is associated with the Feast of Weeks.[30] There are furthermore contained in the Pentateuch a host of commandments that have pertinence only in the Jewish homeland, i.e., in Palestine, and no validity elsewhere.[31]

A religion that laid so much stress on Jewish national values was not suited for those who were not either by ties of blood or historic association related to the Jewish people. Besides that, the distinctive ritual laws of the Jewish Torah were burdensome to the non-Jews who were ready enough to accept Judaism's ethics and its theology but rejected its other phases. The religion, in order to be able to include them, had to be broadened. Its national aspects had to be eliminated. The burdens of the Law had to be removed.[32] This was indeed what Paul of Tarsus set out to accomplish, and the result was a completely universal religion, one that recognized no racial distinctions, no historical differences. The "chosen people" were no longer the descendants of Abraham but those who believed in Christ whatever their extraction might be.[33] The festivals that celebrated occurrences in the history of Israel, if they were retained at all, were recast or reinterpreted to fit the universalist philosophy of the new faith. Thus the original Jewish Passover which commemorated the liberation of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage was transmuted into Easter which recalled the Passion of the Lord by means of which mankind was delivered from sin;[34] and the chief symbols in the ritual of the Passover eve service, namely the unleavened cakes and the wine, which served formerly as reminders respectively of the sufferings of the children of Israel in Egypt and of their redemption by God,[35] assumed in the Christian transformation the significance of the body and the blood of Christ[36] who suffered in order that humanity might live.

The facts that have just been observed explain the difference in attitude between Judaism and Christianity toward proselytism. Judaism, as it is today constituted, is not too eager to win new converts among the gentiles. Not that converts who accept all the conditions imposed by the Jewish faith are not welcome. The high esteem in which the Moabitess Ruth,[37] who voluntarily entered the Jewish fold, was held is eloquent proof to the contrary. The reason why, outside of the period during which Christianity arose,[38] Jews did not go out of their way to make converts was that the Torah with its numerous regulations was intended only for the descendants of Abraham, the other "sons of Noah" being

required to abide only by the seven fundamental rules of social morality.[39] It is true that according to the prophets Israel was to become "a light unto the nations" [40] and that the hope was cherished that a time would come when the peoples of the world would worship the God of Jacob. But to obtain the benefits of that light other nationals needed but come within its radius and behold its brilliance. The luminary would have to do no more than cast its splendor upon them. To note Israel's shining example alone would be sufficient. It was quite otherwise with Christianity. Missionary activity, the conversion of non-believers, was of its very essence, for were it not for the desire to bring the gospel to the gentiles, it would never have come into being.

The central doctrine that the new religion which, having been stripped of its specifically Jewish features, could no longer be called Judaism, i.e., the creed of the Jews, brought to the world was the belief in the Redeemer, in the Christ, which is the Greek equivalent for the Hebrew MESSIAH, (God's) "anointed." Hence its name Christianity. But why should a redeemer have been necessary? Because, says Christian theology, the world was wicked. Ever since Adam and Eve had transgressed over God's command, man had sunk deeper and deeper into sin, and only thru God's own suffering could this sin be wiped clean again.[41] This is a cardinal teaching of Christianity which Judaism rejects. Judaism, too, of course, takes cognizance of man's first sin, but it never attached to it the importance that Christianity does. Adam's transgression had no implications for his descendants. Every human being is free to live his own life and gain salvation for himself thru his deeds without the aid of an intermediary. Scripture does indeed state that the sins of the fathers are visited upon the children.[42] However, as the rabbis explain,[43] in keeping with the prophet Ezekiel's doctrine of individual responsibility,[44] this applies only where the children walk in the footsteps of the fathers. So while Christianity believes that the Messiah has already come, Judaism holds he has not yet arrived, and that when he will, it will be to redeem the Jewish people as a whole, not human beings as individuals.[45]

Christianity served in its beginning at least as an escape from the world of reality, with its materialism, its wickedness and selfishness. The ideals of humility, poverty and chastity,[46] of turning the other cheek, etc., that it preached could better be realized behind the doors of the cloister than in the seething cauldron of world

affairs. But even the privacy of the monastery was unable to insure the fulfillment of the ideal Christian life, because those that lived there still lived in a world of flesh, and flesh was the cause of all sin. Only after the earthly clay is stripped off can man's real life begin. Thus Christianity, and hence Christianity's strong emphasis on the life beyond the grave. Now Judaism, too, as has been remarked before, believes in the immortality of the soul and in a life to be. The dogma of the world to come is one of the thirteen articles of the faith. Yet this doctrine does not play nearly as important a rôle in Jewish as it does in Christian theology. This is evidenced by the fact that the descriptions of heaven and hell given in Jewish traditional literature are extremely vague and indefinite. While the program for the Jew's conduct in this world is worked out in the greatest detail in Jewish theological treatises, the ideas about the nature of the life in the world to be are very meagre. And this cannot be attributed to the Jews' lack of imagination, for the rich imagery of the psalms and other examples of early Hebrew poetry reveal the possession by the Jew of a lively fancy. However it be, the fact is that in the course of its career of thirty-five hundred years Judaism has produced nothing comparable to the artistic expressions of the Christian conception of the afterworld that are to be found in Dante's Inferno or Milton's Paradise Lost. This could not have happened by chance. It was no doubt the consequence of two different Weltanschauungs, one of which was chiefly this-worldly, naturalistic, while the other was primarily other-worldly, an attempt to rise above and defy nature.

Judaism's naturalism can be seen not only in its ethics, which is more compatible with man's instinctive nature than the code of Christianity—how many are there that would turn the other cheek when attacked—but also in its attitude toward the body and matter in general. Whereas Christianity considers carnal intercourse as sin and marriage [47] as a concession wrested from God to human weakness, Judaism, far from regarding it as sinful, looks upon procreation as the fulfillment of man's destiny and lists marriage among the commandments of God, aye the very first to have been issued to man. The clergy of Roman Catholic Christianity, the largest single group in Christendom and also the oldest, is even today not permitted to marry. The priests of the church are expected to lead virtuous lives, and a real life of virtue from the standpoint of Christianity is a life of complete celibacy. Jewish clergymen, to the contrary, must enter wedlock in order to qualify

for office. No congregation that truly adheres to Jewish tradition will engage as its spiritual leader a man who has no wife.

The preceding represents only a bird's eye view of Judaism in its resemblances to and its divergences from Christianity. It by no means pretends to be an exhaustive study or even a comprehensive outline. Nothing has been said of Judaism's essential laws, its vast literature, its long and chequered history, of many of its institutions, its art and its music. For a fuller picture the eager student is referred to such works as Moore's Judaism or Travers Herford's Pharisaism, and of course numerous articles written by competent Jewish scholars in the Jewish Encyclopedia and other such compilations. The more fully he will familiarize himself with the sources, the deeper will be his insight into its philosophy of life and into the causes for Judaism's steadfast refusal, notwithstanding all that it has in common with its daughter faith, to give up its independence and abdicate in favor of Christianity.

MOHAMMED'S JEWISH TEACHERS

We have referred in a preceding chapter to the relatively favorable situation of the Jews under the Crescent on account of the comparative tolerance displayed toward them by the Mohammedan religion. The deep cleavage that once existed—and to a great extent still exists—between the seed of Abraham and the Christian world, owing to the belief on the part of the latter that the ancestors of the former caused the death of the savior of Christendom never had a place, so it was noted, in Jewish-Mohammedan relations, because no charge of such nature has ever been made by Mohammedans against Jews. Whatever crimes the followers of the law of Moses may have been held guilty of by the professors of Islam, they were never accused by the latter of having killed Mohammed, and that was a tremendous advantage, a most important point in the Jews' favor. It is responsible for the generally tolerant attitude on the part of the Moslem majority towards the Jewish minority, and especially of Moslem rulers toward their Jewish subjects, in ages when religious bigotry was the order of the day. Not that there were wanting occasional outbursts of fanaticism that made the lot of the Jew living under the Crescent intolerable, such as the eruption of the Almohades in Spain, which compelled the family of Moses Maimonides to leave their native country.[1] There was, however, nothing in the Mohammedan persecution of Jews to equal the grim fierceness of the massacres executed upon their Jewish neighbors by the warriors of the Cross, or the terrors of the Inquisition instituted by the Catholic rulers of Spain. There never prevailed among Mohammedans that bitter animosity toward the Jew that imbued the Christian masses during the Middle Ages, because there were no Passion Plays, no lurid tales of cruelty on the part of the Jews against the founder of their religion to stir up the Moslem populace.

It is true that the Jews of Medinah, the Arabian city in which the prophet of Islam found refuge after the Hijrah, his forced flight from his native Mecca in the year 622 C.E., refused to recognize Mohammed's prophetic mission, that in fact they taunted and teased him. Nor is it to be denied that he never forgave them their hostility and their obstinate refusal to join him, and that when he became powerful enough he exterminated one of their

tribes and banished the other.[2] Yet for all that the Jews remained, even for Mohammed, the Ahl-al-Kitab, the people of the book, to whom God had once revealed himself, and who as monotheists, or believers in Allah, were not to be classed with the pagans whom Moslems were bidden either to convert or to put to the sword.[3] As a people of the book Jews were subject only to the payment of a tribute "dimmah" to the Mohammedan government, but were otherwise not to be molested in the exercise of their religion.[4] That was the ruling laid down by the second founder of Islam, the creator of the Mohammedan empire, the Caliph Omar, when he conquered Syria and Egypt a few years after Mohammed's death; and it was generally adhered to by his successors.

At all events, whatever may have been his personal grievances against his Jewish neighbors in Medinah, the originator of the Mohammedan faith felt pretty close to them as well as to their religion. Jews and Arabs, had, in his belief, a common ancestor in Abraham, the former tracing their descent from the patriarch thru his younger son Isaac, the latter being related to him thru his older son Ishmael.[5] Jews and Arabs were, therefore, kinsmen, cousins who had grown up in different countries. The religion that Mohammed brought to his Arab countrymen was not supposed by him to have been an innovation, but simply a restoration of the pure creed of Abraham of which Mohammed considered himself to be the last apostle, succeeding Moses and Jesus of Nazareth, both of whom he accepted as prophets along with the other heroes of Jewish and Christian Scripture.[6]

The Koran, the Mohammedan Bible, which was entirely the product of Mohammed's brain,[7] takes for granted the Old and the New Testaments, although it often diverges from them in its historical data and in certain matters of law. But these deviations are not due to any conscious desire on the part of Mohammed to create something new, but chiefly to the fact that the Arabian prophet was not acquainted with the originals of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, but received whatever knowledge he had of them by word of mouth—as is evident from the fact that, with but a few doubtful exceptions, he never quotes the Bible verbatim.[8] Then, too, his Jewish and Christian tutors seem not to have been scholars of the highest calibre. As a result the details of biblical history often became confused in Mohammed's mind, producing the strangest combinations and the most glaring anachronisms; thus he made Haman, the villain of the Book of Esther, a minister

of the Pharaoh of the exodus who lived at least one thousand years before him,[9] and the army's ordeal of drinking from the stream which the Hebrew Scriptures attribute to Gideon was ascribed by him to King Saul.[10] When confronted with these contradictions by the Jews of Medinah, who remembered their Bible sufficiently to notice them, Mohammed's defense was that he had the correct version and that the Jews had falsified the original text.[11]

As for his departures in matters of law and ritual, other considerations besides these had a part in them, the foremost being the exigencies of Arab life and the force of tradition. It was, for example, out of the question to prohibit to the Bedouins the eating of camel's flesh, which was their staple food, or to forbid work on the Sabbath in a country in which the struggle for existence was as fierce as it was in Arabia.[12] Of the Mosaic dietary laws Mohammed retained, therefore, only those pertaining to the prohibition of eating swine's flesh, blood, and carrion,[13] whilst for the repose on the seventh day of the week he substituted the assembly at the mosques for prayer on Fridays.[14] He justified these changes by the declaration that the numerous restrictions imposed upon the Jews were merely a punishment for misbehavior, and that Allah had really never forbidden these things to his faithfuls.[15] As for the biblical statement that God rested on the seventh day after he had completed the work of creation which was conceived by him to have been the chief source for the Jewish institution of the Sabbath, Mohammed stated that that passage had been misconstrued, for there can be no fatigue or lassitude for the Allpowerful.[16] To what extent Mohammed had to yield to the customs of his Arab milieu can be seen from the fact that the direction in prayer, "Kiblah," which, in conformity with Jewish practice he had at first fixed toward Jerusalem, was later transferred by him to Mecca, the ancient holy city of the Arabs,[17] and that he retained as one of the duties of every God-fearing Mohammedan the pilgrimage to the black-stone of the Kaaba, the venerable shrine of Mecca, an institution that had existed since time immemorial during the Jahiliyah, the period of Arab heathendom. This pagan rite was given the sanction of the new monotheistic faith thru the assertion that the Kaaba had been founded by Abraham,[18] whom the Hebrew Scriptures picture as a builder of altars.[19]

The religion brought forth by the camel-driver of Mecca represents, then, no complete divorce from the religious practices that were current among his countrymen up to the time when Islam

arrived on the scene. In fact, no religious system entirely replaces its predecessor. Every new faith that is born is a syncretism incorporating certain elements that were part and parcel of the creed that came before it. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that the Mohammedan religion, which today counts among its adherents 200,000,000 souls, spread all over the world and represented by all the races of man, should betray the influences of the erstwhile creed of the land of its origin. What seems remarkable is rather the fact that in spite of the limitations of his environment and his personal shortcomings, Mohammed should have progressed as far as he did, and have produced a religion possessing real spiritual grandeur and worthy of being classed among the three great monotheistic faiths in the world.

As intimated before, Judaism and Christianity are taken for granted by Islam. Mohammed pretends to incorporate them both into his system, which is ostensibly nothing more than a continuation of its two forerunners. This assertion neither Jews nor Christians will accept, and objective criticism sustains them in their objection. Mohammedanism is not identical with either Judaism or Christianity. This much, however, is true: it is dependent on them and possesses features in common with both of its monotheistic predecessors. Of the two, however, it reveals greater similarities with Judaism than with Christianity.[20] With Judaism Mohammedanism affirms the belief in one God, without modifications or embellishments. The Koran is quite emphatic on this point. Polemicizing against the Christian doctrine of the trinity, it states: "God is one; the self-existent. He begets not and is not begotten and there is none like to Him." [21] The Mosaic dietary laws which Christianity rejected altogether were, as we have seen, retained by Mohammed in part. The five daily services which are supposed by some to have been copied from the Parsee system also have their analogy in the five services of the Jewish Day of Atonement.[22] The rite of circumcision, too, is prevalent among the Mohammedans, although it does not possess in Mohammedanism the binding character which it has in Judaism. The fast of the month of Ramadan seems to bear greater resemblance to the Catholic Lent than to any Jewish institution. Yet it should be recalled that originally the main fast day of the followers of Mohammed was Ashura, the tenth of the month of Muharram, which corresponds exactly to the Jewish Day of Atonement, which occurs on *Asor,* the tenth of Tishri.[23]

When we examine the language of the Koran we discover a great many expressions and technical terms that were taken over bodily from the religious usage of the Jews and are either Hebrew, the language of the Scriptures, or Aramaic, the vernacular of the Jews of Asia in which the Talmuds were written. Examples of such words that are clearly of non-Arab origin are:

Sakinah—Hebrew, Shekinah (the divine presence).
Malakut—Hebrew, Malkut, Malkut Shamayim (the heavenly kingdom).
Ṣalat—Aramic, Ṣ'lota (prayer).
Żakat—Aramic, Ż'kuta (purity, alms).
Jannat Adan—Hebrew, Gan Eden (garden of Eden).
Jahannama—Hebrew, Gehinnom (hell).[24]

Furthermore, we find in the Koran, as shown by several scholars beginning with Abraham Geiger, who one hundred nine years ago wrote his epoch-making essay entitled "Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthume aufgenommen?" ("What did Mohammed adopt from Judaism?"), a wealth of Agada, legends and tales found in the Talmud and the Midrash and other works of Jewish tradition. In fact, the account the Koran gives of biblical characters is rarely the unadorned story found in the scriptural text but usually the highly colored portraiture of rabbinic literature. It knows, for example, of Abraham's breaking his father Terah's idols.[25] It implies a familiarity on the part of its author with the Agadic statement that Joseph was restrained from yielding to the seductions of Potiphar's wife by the apparition of his father Jacob.[26] Such instances can be multiplied by the hundreds. They indicate the extent of the indebtedness of the Mohammedan religion, in its earliest stages at least, to the particularistic teachings of Judaism, aside from the practices and beliefs to which it subscribes that are common to both Judaism and Christianity, such as the giving of charity, the omniscience, the omnipotence, and the providence of God, the day of judgment, and heaven and hell, which are pictured very vividly in the Koran and to which reference is made repeatedly.[27]

That Mohammed borrowed directly from Judaism, and that he had Jewish teachers from whom he received detailed instruction in their religion, is now established beyond the shadow of a doubt. The prophet of Islam protests too vehemently against the charge of passing on information obtained from non-Arabic teachers, and he follows too slavishly the assertions of the Agada, to be taken

at his word when he declares that he has received all his revelations from God.[28] Whether such dependence on Judaism, such direct Jewish influence can be adduced for the later development of the Mohammedan religion is not so certain. Every instance of correspondence is not necessarily a proof of borrowing. There is always the possibility of a common source for the Jewish and the Mohammadan tradition or law in question, or else the parallelism may be due to the fact that the human mind follows certain definite lines of reasoning. Surely if one can discover points of contact between the jurisprudence of the Jews and that of the non-Semitic Romans it should not seem strange that similarities should exist between Mohammedan and Jewish law. And yet sometimes the resemblances are so striking that it is impossible to explain them except on the assumption of interdependence. When, for example, we learn that the Mohammedan law of slaughtering animals calls for the severance of the wind- and the food-pipe,—and it appears most probable that this law, which is found in the Talmud, has taken centuries to crystallize—and when we are told, furthermore, that before performing the act the Mohammedan slaughterer is required to mention the name of Allah, just as it is incumbent upon the Jewish *shochet* to pronounce a benediction as he is about to carry out the *shechitah,* we feel pretty sure that the Mohammedan law has been modeled after the Jewish law. And such cases are legion.[29]

It would take us too far afield to trace even in outline the complete story of the development of Mohammedan law and theology, rich though this evolution is in parallels to what took place in Judaism. A few points, however, must be noted by anyone who wishes to obtain at least an elementary comprehension of the subject. To put it briefly, then, let us state that the principal duties of a Mohammedan are summarized in the following five prescriptions laid down in a tradition attributed to the prophet:[30]

1. The *Shahada,* the declaration that there is no God but Allah, and that Mohammed is his prophet (which is part of every service).
2. *Ṣalat,* the five daily prayers.
3. *Zakat,* the giving of alms.
4. *Ṣiyam,* the fast of the month of Ramadan. (Of course, it is impossible for any human being to fast an entire month. What is meant, rather, is that during this month Mohammedans fast during the day but feast at night.)
5. The *Ḥajj,* the pilgrimage to Mecca which every devout Moslem must endeavor to undertake at least once during his lifetime.

These constitute but a fractional portion of the rules for the guidance of the life of a Moslem that have accumulated since the days of Mohammed, about which tomes upon tomes have been written and which define not only the right belief but regulate every movement of man from the use of a toothpick at the table to the manner in which he must proceed in acquiring a wife. A certain modern Christian scholar who wrote on Mohammedan jurisprudence [31] found it rather perplexing that what is apparently only religious law should be so comprehensive and all-embracing. Evidently he has never seen the Jewish Shulchan 'Arukh, for, if he had, his amazement could not have been so great. In fact, if he were to compare certain sections of the table of contents of the Jewish code, in English translation, with that of a Mohammedan digest, he would not be able to tell them apart, so great is the resemblance. Let us try it out by taking at random two codes, one Mohammedan and one Jewish.

Code A.

Book Two. Of Prayer.

1. The time of prayer.
2. Upon whom prayer is incumbent.
3. On what occasions.
4. The antecedent requirements of prayer.
5. The eighteen essential parts of prayer.
6. The four things in which the prayer of a woman differs from that of a man.
7. The eleven things which nullify prayer.
8. A reckoning of the occurrences of certain frequently repeated elements in prayer.
9. On omissions in prayer.
10. The five occasions on which prayer is not allowable.
11. The duty and ritual of congregational prayer.
12. The prayer of a traveler.
13. The conditions under which congregational prayer is required.
17. Prayer for rain.

Code B.

89. The laws of prayer and its times.
90. Where it is proper to pray with the congregation and the prayer of a traveler.
91. That one must gird one's loins and cover one's head at prayer.
92. The law of washing and other preparations for prayer.
93-98. Various requirements of prayer.
99. That he who is intoxicated may not pray.

106. Who is absolved from prayer.
108. He who has omitted to pray by mistake or for other reasons.
221. Benedictions of thanksgiving and for rain.

The first of these two lists is an analysis of the contents of book two of the *"Taqrib"* of Abu Shuja al Ispahani, a Mohammedan theologian; the second is an excerpt from the table of contents of the *Orach Chaim,* the first part of the Jewish *Shulchan 'Arukh.* We defy anyone to distinguish between them in this rendering.

To come now to the evolution of Mohammedanism, we may say that in general it proceeded along lines similar to those of Judaism. Like the Jews, Mohammedans have their written law, their Torah *shebik'tab,* which the *Koran* comprises, and alongside it an oral tradition, *Sunna,* corresponding to the Torah *sheb'al peh* of the Jews, complementing and supplementing the written law.[32] Like the Jewish oral law this *Sunna* was for a long time not committed to writing but transmitted by word of mouth from teacher to pupil. The *Hadith,* the body of traditional literature which contains this oral law, exists in several different recensions, just as did the various collections of the Mishnah until Rabbi Judah ha-Nassi made his authoritative compilation.[33] It is very much like the Agadic section of the Talmud, containing the table talk and the usages of the prophet and of his companions, answers to various questions of law, anecdotes, legends, and interpretations of the Koran. As the law developed, variations in ritual arose similar to the differences between the Ashkenazic and Sephardic rites of the Jews. Four such traditional rituals, all regarded as Orthodox (the Shafiite, the Hanifite, the Hanbalite, and the Malikite) have maintained themselves until this day.[34] As in Judaism, furthermore, acts are divided by Mohammedan law into:

1. *wajib,* obligatory (corresponding to Jewish chobah);
2. *mandub,* recommended (corresponding to Jewish mitzvah);
3. *ja'iz,* optional (corresponding to Jewish r'shut);
4. *makruh,* reprehensible but not punishable (corresponding to Jewish patur abal asur);
5. *haram,* culpable, forbidden (corresponding to Jewish chayyab).[35]

Finally, Mohammedanism produced its mystics who claim possession of a sort of Kabalah or secretly transmitted lore,[36] its parallel to the Zaddik-worship of the Chassidim in the apotheosis of the Imam,[37] the religious leader of the age who must be a lineal descendant from the prophet, and in a belief corresponding to the Jewish belief in the Messiah, in the form of the hope of the re-

appearance of the Mahdi,[38] the absent leader who is to usher in a reign of justice.

We have observed thus far in what way Mohammedanism was influenced by Judaism, the channels being at first the Jewish informants of Mohammed, and later on, no doubt, the Jewish scholars with whom the Mohammedan legislators in Iraq and Syria must have had frequent contact. There are records to show that the relations between the Caliphs at Bagdad and the Jewish exilarchs, who were occasionally also the spiritual heads of Jewry and who lived in the vicinity, were quite intimate.[39] For a while, then, Jews were the teachers and Mohammedans their pupils. In the course of time, however, the rôles were changed and the erstwhile pupils began to teach their teachers. The conquest of Persia brought the Arabs in contact with the Syrian priests who had opened schools there and preserved in Syrian translation the philosophy and the science of the ancient Greeks, after the fanatical Byzantine emperors had closed the academies of learning in their domains. These works, culture-loving Caliphs, like Harun al Rashid of Arabian Nights fame, caused to be rendered into Arabic, and thus brought about a renaissance in the cultivation of science and the allied disciplines.[40] The Jews, who for centuries had confined themselves to the study of the Talmud and traditional lore and had for sundry reasons not ventured outside the four ells of the Halakah, soon followed suit. In imitation of their Mohammedan neighbors they began to investigate the grammar of their own Hebrew language, the technical terms for which were coined from Arabic prototypes.[41] Their poets wrote love lyrics, the imagery and ideology of which were identical with those of their Arabic counterparts;[42] they even used Arabic meter. One of them, the celebrated Judah ha-Levi, protested, indeed, against this prostitution of the holy tongue by subjecting it to the rhythm of the language of the son of the slave.[43] Yet he himself sinned against his own preachments.

Most of all, however, can the influence of the Arab masters upon the Jews be detected in the matter of secular science and philosophy. The Arabs preceded the Jews as writers on these subjects, and practically all the books composed thereon by the latter in lands of Mohammedan religion and Arabic speech were written in the Arabic tongue. Even so outstanding a Jewish thinker as Moses Maimonides, whom not only Jews but also his Mohammedan contemporaries recognized as a great savant,[44] betrays his

dependence on Arabic masters. He quotes constantly from the Arabic commentators of Aristotle, Alfarabi, and Avicenna. The "Guide of the Perplexed," his chief philosophical work, was written in the Arabic vernacular, and all his learning in the scientific field is derived from Arabic sources and ultimately from Mohammedan teachers. He worked out his own conciliation between Judaism and Aristotle, to be sure. His scientific views, however, were entirely those of his Arabic environment. The deep impression made upon their Jewish contemporaries by the Mohammedan mystics, the Sufis, has been amply demonstrated by Professor Yahuda in his introduction to Bachyah ibn Pakuda's "The Duties of the Hearts," in which the editor points out the numerous references by this popular Jewish ethical writer to Sufic literature.

The Jews had taught the Arabs religion and law. The Arabs in turn instructed them in science and philosophy, repaying them measure for measure, and then again a change took place. Towards the middle of the twelfth century religious fanaticism put an end to the spirit of free inquiry among the Mohammedans, which had found a haven of refuge in Andalusia, southern Spain. Just as at the eastern end of the Mediterranean six hundred years previously, so now at its western extremity the schools of philosophy were closed and Mohammedan culture began its downward path. When this happened, when philosophers were thrown into prison and their works burnt, the Jewish pupils of the Arabs did their masters the act of grace of preserving the proscribed fruits of their intellectual activity, by translating their works into Hebrew.[45] Many of the treatises of Averroes and other Mohammedan savants of the Middle Ages have come down to us only in the Hebrew recension made of them by the Tibbonides, the Kimhides, the Kaspis, the Narbonis, and other Jewish scholars who took up in Provence, southern France, the thread of scientific speculation dropped in Spain.

The greatest blow to Mohammedan civilization, however, a blow from which it has not yet been able to recover, was dealt by the Mongols, who in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries overran the greater part of the territory conquered by the Arabs, pillaging, plundering, and burning, massacring the population, ransacking palaces, and destroying libraries. So complete was the destruction wrought by these ruthless invaders that since that time Islam has not produced one original creation of outstanding merit, not one great historian, litterateur, philosopher, or poet.[46] The

days of Islam's glory are in the past. The finest relics of Mohammedan architecture, such as the Alhambra of Granada, the mosque of the Sultan Hassan in Cairo, and the mosque of Omar in Jerusalem, date from the time before the end of Mongol rule. So do also the greatest works of Arabic literature. But although the artists and philosophers and poets and jurists of Islam are gone, the religion lives on. It has large groups of followers as far east as the Philippines and China and as far west as Morocco, in the lost villages of the Sahara, and the upper reaches of the Himalayan mountains in India, not to speak of Persia, Arabia, Syria, the whole of North Africa, Turkey, and the Balkan Peninsula. And Islam is still making new conquests.

Among the Occidental students of Islamic literature and institutions and their interpreters to the western world the proportion of Jews has been exceedingly large. The researches of Goldziher, Horowitz, Hirschfeld, Munk, Derenbourg, Margoliouth, Vambery, Yahuda, and others have contributed enormously to the understanding and knowledge of Mohammedan civilization and culture, and are indications of the feeling of kinship that still exists among Jews with the Arabs and of the former's recollection of their whilom association with the latter. Of this genuine desire on the part of Jews for a rapprochement with the Mohammedan Arabic speaking world, the scientific labors of the Oriental seminary established over a decade ago at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem are eloquent evidence. Dr. Hugo Bergmann, former rector of this unique Jewish institution, took great pride in the accomplishments of this branch of the only Hebrew academy of learning in the world, because he considered it one of the most effective means for winning the confidence of the Palestinian Jews' Arab neighbors. If the Mohammedan could only be convinced that the Jew has no intentions of robbing him of his spiritual heritage, there is hope that he, in his turn, will respect the Jew's political and cultural claim to the little strip of earth which became the holy land of three religions because Jews once inhabited it and taught in it the belief in the one God, revered alike by Moslem and Jew.

GOD HAS NOT CHANGED

The most important word in the human vocabulary is the term "God." It consists in the English language of only three letters, but what has been read into it could fill whole libraries, and the contribution to this literature by Jews alone is very considerable. That it should be so is not at all surprising. A people that taught mankind the concept of monotheism should have had a great deal to say on the subject of God. Yet, although the belief in the sole Master of the universe is something fundamental, basic in the Jew's religious heritage, anyone denying His existence calling upon himself the opprobrium of heresy, and although, as the prophet Malachi asserts, God's nature has not changed,[1] it cannot be claimed that all Jews that ever professed to believe in God conceived of Him in the same form.

Even a superficial study of the sources will reveal the fact that the views entertained of the Supreme Being by believing Jews have varied not only from age to age but also in one and the same generation. The differences of opinion relative to the essential character of the deity between two such contemporary rabbinical authorities as Moses Maimonides and Rabbi Abraham ben David of Posquieres in Southern France, for example, were so wide and divergent as to lead to bitter clashes that divided the Jewish world of their time into two hostile camps.[2] These hostilities might, of course, have been avoided. The differences of opinion, however, that gave rise to them could not, because the meanings that words will have for an individual depend upon his mental equipment, his intellectual development, his level of culture, his environment, and his contacts. This applies to the term God as well as it does to any other concept. A primitive, naive person will have a childish notion of deity. He will picture the Almighty as a sort of glorified human being, who has his abode somewhere in the upper regions of the world, which he manages as purveyor-in-chief, and who is ready at all times to do the bidding of those that acknowledge his rule if only they approach him properly. A more mature, sophisticated individual, accustomed to thinking in abstract terms, will understand by the word God a spiritual force that is not at all located in space but has its abode in a plane of existence entirely

different from that of material things and that possesses modes of behavior totally unlike those of mortal men.

It is, therefore, difficult to speak of a uniform, standard Jewish idea of God, notwithstanding Judaism's discovery and popularization of monotheism, because even this monotheism did not mean one and the same thing to all Jews at all times. The best that those seeking enlightenment on this subject can do is to examine the written records left by different generations of Jews and on the basis of these data formulate in broad outline the conception peculiar to each. Even then the results may not be absolutely certain. For in order to see God as Israel's ancestors who lived many years ago saw Him, it is necessary for their modern offspring to project himself in imagination into their age, and that is a most difficult feat to perform. It requires, first of all, the throwing off of preconceived notions, the discarding of many ideas that have become fashionable and commonplace. This is an obstacle that even the most unbiased finds hard to hurdle, and yet whoever has failed herein runs the risk of committing such anachronisms as those of those would-be-historians who made Reform Jews out of the Pharisees in an age in which the conditions responsible for the emergence of the present-day Jewish religious reform movement did not exist, or who depicted as Communists the prophets who could not even remotely have dreamt of anything like our modern capitalistic system.

We have intimated before—and that is now almost universally admitted by reputable scholars—that monotheism owed its rise and dissemination in the civilized society of the West to Judaism. It may be urged against this claim by some that, before the time when the Torah is believed to have been given to Israel at Sinai, an Egyptian Pharaoh by the name of Ikhnaton had declared the Sun-God Ra' or Re' to be the only divine being in existence and ordered the abolition of the worship of all other deities of the Egyptian pantheon.[3] It may also be claimed that the Greek philosophers of the 6th century before the common era entertained the view of a single divine ruler of the universe, the cause of all causes, the prime mover of all creation [4]—as exalted and spiritual a view as that held by any of the Jewish prophets. In answer to these objections one need only point to the fact that, however advanced Ikhnaton's theology might have been, it did not survive his reign, but was given up when his regime came to an end.[5] As for the teachings of the wise men, the philosophoi or "lovers of wisdom"

of ancient Hellas, they never reached the masses, which remained, until the end of the era of paganism, steeped in the grossest superstitions.[6] It was only in Israel that the attempt to do away with polytheism and the worship of idols proved successful, and the first people as a people to adopt monotheism and all that that implied were the Jews.

Just when and how monotheism was ushered in and by what means it became established among Israel's ancestors is a matter of dispute between tradition and the modern Bible critics. The spokesmen for the former would carry its institution back to Moses.[7] Nay they can see the beginning of its formulation to have already been accomplished by Father Abraham.[8] The latter, on the other hand, refuse to acknowledge its emergence before the time of the later prophets. It did not manifest itself, so they declare, until the Temple of Jerusalem had been destroyed by the Babylonians in 586 B.C.E. and an unknown prophet, whose collection of sermons was appended to those of Isaiah, preached to the Judeans exiled in Babylonia a purer and loftier conception of God than they had ever heard expounded theretofore.[9] Without entering into a lengthy analysis of the arguments upon which the advocates of the latter point of view base their conclusions it would be well to note that so eminent a scholar and recognized an authority on the religions of the ancient Orient as Professor W. F. Albright of the Johns Hopkins University, a man of the widest erudition, who is thoroughly scientific in his method and cannot be accused of the blind acceptance of Jewish tradition, has recently, as a result of an exhaustive study of the subject, ventured the opinion that monotheism owes its origin to Israel's teacher Moses, who was not, as Freud would have it, a mythical, legendary figure, but a personality of indubitable existence. This assertion must, of course, according to Albright, be taken with a grain of salt. "If," says he, "by 'monotheist' is meant a thinker with views specifically like those of Philo Judaeus or Rabbi Aqiba, of St. Paul or St. Augustine, of Mohammed or Maimonides, of St. Thomas or Calvin, of Mordecai Kaplan or H. N. Wieman, Moses was not one. If, on the other hand, the term monotheist teaches the existence of only one God, the creator of everything, the source of justice, who is equally powerful in Egypt, in the desert and in Palestine, who has no sexuality and no mythology, who is human in form but cannot be seen by human eye and cannot be represented in any form—then the founder of Yahwism was[10] certainly a monotheist."

In refutation of the above statement the proponents of the so-called critical theory may cite such remarks as the one ascribed to Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, to the effect that Israel's God, Adonai, was "greater than all other gods," [11] which implied that Adonai was not the only God, that there were other deities also but that Israel's God was more powerful than they and, therefore, deserving of exclusive worship. This, they might say, constitutes incontrovertible proof of the fact that in the days of Moses the Jews were not yet monotheists but merely henotheists, i.e., they had not yet arrived at the realization, expressed in Deuteronomy [12] and in Isaiah [13] that there exists but one God, but only that their God was jealous of His rights and demanded their entire devotion, as it was clearly put by Jephtah, one of the judges who led Israel after Joshua: "Wilt thou not possess that which Chemosh thy god giveth thee to possess? So whosoever the Lord our God hath dispossessed from before us, them will we possess." [14]

However when one views such passages objectively, one is forced to admit, as Professor Albright justly remarks, that they prove nothing at all. Jethro, as a priest of the Midianites, was never claimed to have been a monotheist. As for Jephtah, it was only natural that in addressing a non-Jew like the king of the Ammonites he should speak a language and use illustrations that the latter would understand. Just as a Jew of today would, in speaking to gentiles unacquainted with Jewish institutions, describe a synagogue as a church and rabbis as ministers of religion or pastors, although in reality they are neither, so did an Israelite in ancient times bolster his right to the possession of the lands he conquered by referring to authorities similar to those invoked by his adversary in support of his own. And lest anybody still insist that the statement that Israel's "God was greater than all other gods" implied that these other gods also possessed reality, one finds exactly such an assertion in the second book of Chronicles, which all admit to have been written at a time when monotheism was already firmly intrenched in Israel, i.e., about the year 400 B.C.E., the era of the second commonwealth. It too declares that "our God is greater than all (other) gods." [15]

Now truthfully speaking we are today too far removed from the age of Moses or even of the prophets to be able to form an accurate idea of just how they pictured God. This much, however, may be set down as beyond cavil, namely that their chief task and problem was the stamping out of the belief in many gods and in

the visible forces of nature to the adoration of which their people had been addicted and to which, under the influence of their surroundings, they continually reverted. That is why they constantly emphasized the power of the God of Israel over against the effeteness of the godlings of the gentiles to whom they mockingly referred as ELILIM, i.e. "things of naught," [16] and whom they derided in such terms as those employed by the 115th psalm, which describes the idols as having "mouths that do not speak, eyes that do not see and ears that do not hear." The desire to stamp out polytheism also accounts for biblical Judaism's violent opposition to the representation of deity by graven or molten images.[17]

When the biblical epoch was over and the rabbinic era had begun the emphasis in the Jewish conception of God was shifted. The danger of lapsing into polytheism or into the gross idol worship of former days on the part of the Jewish rank and file was no longer as great as it used to be because mankind had made some progress in these matters. Monotheism had become pretty firmly rooted among Jews, and the Greeks, with whom they now came in contact, were culturally much more advanced than the ancient Egyptians, Babylonians or Canaanites had been. They were after all a people of philosophers and thinkers. They did not worship as gods the lower animals, as the Egyptians had been wont to do,[18] nor the sun and the moon and the stars and the various forces of nature, as had been the practice of the Babylonians.[19] Their doctrines presented a different type of challenge to the religion of Israel from that which the beliefs and rites of the former had constituted. The Greeks were preeminently humanists. They set up—such was at least the teaching of their popular philosophers, the sophists—man as the measure of all values.[20] They pictured their gods in the form of human beings, attributing to them all the weaknesses of man, ascribing to them human passions and foibles, conceiving of them as engaging in love affairs and in playing pranks on one another and other such things.[21] This ran counter to Israel's exalted conception of deity. "God is not man that he should lie" [22] is a statement put into the mouth of a heathen prophet in the fourth book of Moses. He is holy. "For holy am I, the Lord, your God." [23] He is perfect and incapable of injustice. "The Rock, His work is perfect, for all His ways are justice. A God of faithfulness, without injustice, righteous and upright is He." [24] It became necessary, therefore, to combat the hellenistic point of view not only by opposing on pain of death the

setting up of statues or the sculptured form of human beings in the Temple or the living quarters of Jews,[25] but also by eradicating all traces of anthropomorphism from the ideology of the Jew.

This attempt to assert the Jewish idea of God over against the dominant view is evident from the translation or rendering that the rabbis gave to certain expressions used in connection with God in the Bible as well as from their terminology when speaking of deity. Take for example, the passage in Exodus in which, after having received the assurance that the sin of making the golden calf had been forgiven to Israel, Moses asks to be shown the glory of God. God's answer to this request is that "no man could behold" God "and live." [26] At best Moses could look upon God's hindmost portion. "And thou shalt see My back, but My face shall not be seen." [27] Taken literally this description was much too crass to tally with the spiritual conception of God entertained by the Jewish sages. So the Aramaic translation of Onkelos, which had the sanction and was no doubt also the result of the inspiration at least of the rabbis, tones down the anthropomorphism by rendering the last quoted verse: "And thou wilt see what is behind Me, but what is before Me cannot be seen." Furthermore, when the Eternal is depicted in rabbinic literature as exhibiting human traits, as when it is asserted that "He is pained whenever Israel is in distress," [28] some such qualifying phrase as KIB'YAKOL [29] (if it were possible to say such a thing of God) is usually added. Again very often instead of presenting God Himself as coming into relation with man, His SHEKINAH, i.e., presence, an effluence of the divine essence, is substituted for Him. Thus, when the Israelites were ordered "to make a sanctuary in order that God might dwell in their midst," [30] the rabbis, as the translation of the Targum indicates, rendered the command: "Let them make before Me a sanctuary that I may cause My presence to abide among them." So also many prayers of the synagogue, in order to avoid ascribing to God any change of affections or of will, begin with the introductory formula: "May it be the will before Thee."

Such substitutions are already found in the Bible where, instead of God Himself, the glory of God is spoken of as manifesting itself. Thus it is stated in Leviticus: "That the glory of the Lord may appear unto you." [31] This method of interpreting anthropomorphic passages employed by the rabbis also proves that, whenever the Talmud refers to God as possessing human traits, as when He is described as wearing philacteries—the Midrash cites a homi-

letic rendering to this effect of the verse "And thou shalt see My back" [32]—it was meant only in a poetic sense and is not to be taken literally. For Israel's sages of the Talmudic era had long already learnt to think in abstract terms. They were fully aware of the existence of natural laws, as is evidenced by the fact that such miracles as the cleaving of the Red Sea are said by them to have been preordained simultaneously with the creation of the world.[33] God's qualities of mercy and justice, the MIDDAT HARACHAMIM and MIDDAT HADDIN, were spoken of by them not as though they were the attributes of a physical being, but as forces inherent in the very order of the universe. God is often referred to by them as HAMMAQOM,[34] literally "space," because "It is He that embraces the universe and not the universe that embraces Him." [35] Destiny, too, was conceived of as an abstraction. "All is foreseen and choice is given (unto man)" is the phraseology employed by Rabbi Akiba in his famous dictum concerning divine prescience and the freedom of the human will, not "God foresees and gives choice." Likewise reward and punishment, whether it be in this world or the next, are not represented as articles that the heavenly father metes out with His hands, but as principles that are part and parcel of the divine scheme of things.

The Talmudic era came to a close and the paganism of the classic past died a natural death, its place being taken in the West by the monotheistic religions that were the offshoots of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. The theology of Judaism no longer had to contend against the humanization of God. The opposition now consisted of such doctrines as the Christian teaching of the trinity, i.e., God's three-fold personality, Christianity's dogma of the incarnation, i.e., God's appearance in the flesh, and the claim of the Mohammedans that the Torah received by Moses at Sinai had been superseded by the new dispensation of Mohammed.[36] To combat such unorthodox theories and safe-guard Judaism religious philosophers like Moses Maimonides set up catechisms such as the latter's "thirteen articles of the faith." Over against the Christian precept of the triune aspect of God's nature, they emphasized His absolute unity upon which it was forbidden as blasphemy to cast any doubt by the ascription of qualities that bore the slightest implication of multiplicity on His part.[37] In opposition to the dogma of the incarnation, the essence of God's character was said by most of the Jewish theologians of the Middle Ages to be inaccessible to the human understanding. Thus, for

example, the biblical passage quoted previously: "And thou shalt see My back but My face shall not be seen," which the rabbinic translators had rendered: "And thou mayest see what is before Me, but what is behind Me cannot be seen" is interpreted by Moses Maimonides, the foremost among the Jewish rationalists of the medieval period: "God's essence cannot be known. We can only infer His existence from the results of His activities." [38] As for the Torah of Moses, declared this spokesman of post-Talmudic Judaism, it is eternal, not subject to change. "I believe with a perfect faith that this Law will not be changed, and that there will never be any other law from the Creator blessed be He." [39] This statement was directed against the claims of the New Testament as well as the Koran.

Like their predecessors of the rabbinic era Jewish thinkers of the Middle Ages grappled with such problems as the contradiction between God's foreknowledge and predetermination of everything, which was required by the belief in His omnipotence, and man's complete freedom to choose his way of life, without which there could be no morality nor reward of virtue or punishment of vice.[40] They also attempted to reconcile the existence in the world of evil with the indubitable goodness of God.[41] On the whole they rejected the fatalism of the Mohammedans, most of whom ascribed whatever happened in the universe to the will of Allah,[42] even though this rejection of God's determinism implied a certain limitation of His power.

For some Jews who were still living in the Talmudic past the philosophical views of thinkers like Maimonides seemed too bold, and, as has been noted before, a violent controversy arose over them, the Jewish world being torn asunder for two centuries between Maimonists and anti-Maimonists. But the battle between faith and reason has long already died down. Moses Maimonides' so-called heretical views are now regarded as orthodox. His "thirteen articles of the faith" have been recognized as the basis of Jewish belief and have been incorporated in the daily ritual of the synagogue. There is nothing strange about this, for we are living in a different age, an age in which many of the questions that the medieval Jewish philosophers were most concerned about are no longer vital issues. The most formidable rivals of the Jewish teachings about God and His Law today are not the Christian or the Mohammedan theologies but the pseudo-philosophical doctrines of modern scientists and the ethical theories of the new

political and economic systems. It isn't as if the Master of the Universe had changed. He is the same as He was ages ago when He was first discovered by Israel's ancestors. There is need, however, today to emphasize different aspects of His character in order effectively to combat those heresies that are manifesting themselves in our age. Over against the mechanistic conception of the universe, the thesis still adhered to by many scientists that the world is nothing but a huge machine and that the activities that have been construed as those of man's soul are only functions of the body, over against this thesis it is necessary to assert God's spirituality, to point to the inadequacy of the behavior of matter as an explanation of the phenomena of life.[43] In opposition to the attempt on the part of the Nazi ideologists to divide the world into superior and inferior races, of masters and slaves, it becomes Judaism's rôle to remind men that, having been created by one God, the world is a united whole and that mankind, therefore, constitutes one large family between the members of which such unfair discrimination is not permissible. This God, whose children, all human beings are without distinction of race, color or creed, this God, the Jewish theologian of our time must insist, is, besides being his creator, also man's liberator and redeemer. He is immanent in the human struggle for freedom. He is also the "father of the orphaned and the judge of the widowed" [44] who does not permit injustice to triumph forever. Realpolitik may succeed for a while. Might may temporarily crush right. But "might is not forever, nor doth the crown endure unto all generations." [45]

These new emphases in the Jewish conception of God that are required by the ideologies of our age are noticeable in the works of some of the foremost Jewish theologians of our time, such as those of Mordecai M. Kaplan, Louis Finkelstein, and others. One may not agree with everything in their philosophy of Judaism. One may reject their system as a whole. Their service, however, in pointing out the spiritual and social implications of the Jewish ideas about God is a contribution to Jewish religious thought that all may accept without reservation.

To sum up, then, Israel's God, as Malachi expressed it, has not changed. The truth, in whatever guises or forms man may conceive it, is one and immutable. What appears to some as an evolution or development in the Jewish God idea is merely a change of emphasis on different aspects of His nature necessitated by the varying exigencies of different ages.

PEOPLE OF THE BOOK

"'This is the book of the generations of man,' . . . . which indicates that the Holy One Blessed Be He showed the first man every generation with its preachers, its scholars and its leaders. When he reached the generation of Rabbi Akiba, he rejoiced at his learning and was sad over his death."

Babylonian Talmud 'Abodah Zarah 5a

"WITH ALL THY LIFE"

In the traditional Passover Haggadahs, that used to be in vogue until a group of modern Jewish artists came along and changed it all, the very first illustration that struck the reader's eye was a medieval woodcut of what was supposed to be the scene of a Passover banquet held some 1800 odd years ago in the Palestinian town of Bnei Brak, not far from the ancient port of Jaffa. The principal figures at this banquet were five of the foremost Jewish leaders of the time one of whom, in fact the host who had apparently invited the others to spend the holiday with him at his home, was the hero of our story, Rabbi Akiba. The details of the discussion that is said to have taken place at that banquet, a discussion that is reported to have lasted all thru the night, has not been transmitted to posterity. All that is known is that the conversation revolved around the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt and that it must have been a rather animated and absorbing colloquy, because those who participated in it were so deeply engrossed in it that they did not notice that the night had slipped by and the day had dawned until their pupils called the fact to their attention by announcing to them that the hour had arrived for reciting the Shema'[1] that is pronounced at daybreak.

The picture that is painted by the tradition recorded in the Haggadah of the five Jewish sages pondering the significance of one of the great events of their people's past and punctiliously observing the time of prayer affords one a glimpse into the world of rabbinic Judaism, the form that the Jewish religion has had ever since the destruction of the second temple in the year 70 C.E. and in which, if not by dint of which, it survived until modern times. The bond of unity, binding this world together and making of its parts a well-integrated whole, were not the geographical boundaries of a state within which its constituents resided, nor even a central sanctuary, a national shrine toward which pilgrims from the most distant corners of the earth would stream every year in order to demonstrate their devotion to the God worshipped by them in common. It was something less tangible and concrete and yet more compelling than these two ties in exacting the obedience of those who professed to be bound by it, namely a book. And the persons who dominated this world were not men distinguished

by success in the field of battle like the early kings of Israel. Nor was it on account of their wealth or the nobility of their descent that they exerted a sway over their contemporaries like the priests during the days of the second commonwealth.[2] They were first and foremost scholars, and whatever authority they wielded—and this authority must have been considerable when it is recalled that thru it a race was kept intact for over 1700 years without the application of the least bit of physical force—was due entirely to their scholarship, to their knowledge of the contents of this book and its official interpretation. Jewish leadership was vested, in other words, during the rabbinic age in the hands of an intellectual aristocracy, of individuals who commanded respect by virtue of their erudition and learning. "A scholar of illegitimate birth," such was the motto reflecting the prevailing view, "is preferable to a high-priest, i.e., a blue-blood of blue-bloods, who is an ignoramus." [3]

One of these aristocrats of the intellect, who had more than perhaps any of his predecessors or successors to do with molding the system of practices and beliefs that constitute the Judaism of tradition as it is known from the extant rabbinic literature, was Akiba ben Joseph.[4] Akiba ben Joseph, or Rabbi Akiba, which is his common designation in the sources, was by far not the first representative of his class. He was preceded by a long line of Tannaim, by whole generations of masters of Jewish law and theology. It included, this line, such shining lights as the gentle Hillel and Rabban Jochanan ben Zakkai, whose happy thought of establishing the school at Jabne just as Jerusalem was about to fall, saved Judaism from extinction.[5] It extended all the way back to the scribe Ezra, who brought back the Torah to the Jews who had settled in Palestine after the first exile. Yes, the father of rabbinic Judaism did not burst like a meteor upon the horizon of Jewish life. The ground had been prepared for centuries for his blossoming forth. Long before the temple had been destroyed and the Jews had, together with their spiritual center, lost their home, while the priests that performed the services at the altar were still the ruling power in Jewish religious as well as spiritual life, there grew up a group of lay scholars who occupied no official position in the government, who headed no institution, whose educational activities were of a purely private nature, intended solely to enable the average Jew, wherever he might live, to observe the tenets of his faith. When, then, the national sanctuary was razed to the ground and the priestly service was perforce compelled to be

suspended and the hegemony of the sons of Aaron came therewith to an end, whatever vestige of Jewish self-government was left fell naturally into the hands of these men who alone possessed the intellectual equipment necessary for keeping alive the memories of the past.[6] Ever since that time the rabbis have been the guardians of Judaism, and it was the achievement of Rabbi Akiba in particular to forge the vessel that was to hold the precious contents and prevent the evaporation and disintegration of Jewish living.

Posterity has vied with contemporaries in singing the praises of this remarkable man who has been hailed as the regenerator and preserver of Jewish tradition. What those in his immediate entourage, who knew him at first hand and basked in the sunshine of his radiant personality, thought of him may be gauged by such expressions of admiration as the one on the part of his one-time teacher and later on colleague, Rabbi Tarphon, who, upon hearing from his mouth a brilliant resolution of a knotty problem, exclaimed: "Akiba, whoever separates from thee separates from life." [7] It is also evidenced by the testimony of strangers concerning his fame that it was spread "from one end of the world to the other." [8] As for the opinion about him of succeeding generations, he was likened to Shaphan and Ezra, each of whom had rescued the Torah from oblivion, the first by bringing to King Josiah the book of the Law discovered in the temple, the second by teaching the Torah to the Palestinian Jews of his day.[9] Some went even further in their panegyrics of his achievements by rating them even higher than the accomplishments of the lawgiver Moses himself. "Secrets," said they, "that had not been revealed to our teacher Moses were disclosed to Rabbi Akiba." And legend has it that when Israel's first leader arrived in heaven to receive the Law from the hand of God, he found the Eternal attaching crowns to the letters of the Hebrew alphabet. When he inquired: "Master of the universe, what reason is there for this precaution?", God is said to have replied: "There is a man destined to arise at the end of many generations who will derive from every stroke of a Yod whole mountains of new regulations." His curiosity aroused, Israel's teacher thereupon asked to be shown this remarkable person, and God directed him to move down eighteen rows and listen to the discussion that was taking place. He was, however, unable to understand what was being said, and so in great despair he returned to the Almighty and said to Him: "Master of the universe, if you have one like this among your creatures, why did

you give the Torah thru me?" But God silenced him quickly enough. "Be still," said He. "Such is My sovereign will." [10]

Several books have been composed during the past few years on the life and work of Rabbi Akiba, the most recent one, which skilfully weaves together all that has been recorded about him by tradition, being a volume from the pen of Professor Louis Finkelstein, the present president of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Yet the statement made by Professor Louis Ginzberg some thirty-five years ago in the Jewish Encyclopedia that "a full history of Akiba, based on authentic sources, will probably never be written" still remains unchallenged. A compilation like that of Dr. Finkelstein's, for example, is compelled to draw rather heavily on the imagination. It must exercise a great deal of ingenuity in order to extricate from the thick shell of fancy with which piety has surrounded it the kernel of historical truth. When that is done, it turns out that Rabbi Akiba served as a most eloquent corroboration of that democratic principle, so characteristic of the orientation prevalent during the rabbinic era, according to which intellectual attainments far outweighed the advantages of pedigree or birth. For whether it is true or not, as tradition would have it, that he was descended from proselytes,[11] certain it seems that he was of obscure and humble origin. This surmise is confirmed by the fact that when a successor was sought in the academy to the deposed president Rabban Gamaliel and the names of various candidates came up for consideration, it was brought out that Rabbi Akiba lacked ZEKUT ABOT, i.e., that he had no family antecedents to boast of.[12]

Rabbi Akiba's birthplace must have been somewhere in the south of Palestine, for when his son died and people came from far and wide to comfort him, he remarked in his modesty that he could very well understand that the southerners, the ANSHEI DAROM, should know of him, but that the natives of Galilee in the north should also have heard of him, that was to him a matter of surprise.[13]

According to all indications Rabbi Akiba's scholarly career did not begin until rather late in life.[14] He frequently recalled in his years of maturity his ignorance in the days of his youth, when, as an illiterate shepherd, he hated the learned class with such an intense hate that he could have bitten a scholar with the bite of a donkey.[15] It is related in the Talmud that he worked on the estate of one of the rich men of Jerusalem, a certain Kalba Sabua', whose

daughter Rachel fell in love with him and decided to marry him because she had detected in him certain superior qualities. The condition of the proposal of marriage, which, contrary to all practice, was made in this instance by the woman rather than the man, was that he go to school and study. The offer was accepted, and the couple eloped and were secretly married. When the father of Rachel learned what his daughter had done, he disinherited her. But Rachel remained true to her husband, with whom she shared the extremest privations, to the extent of even selling her beautiful tresses in order to maintain him while he was studying. When, after twelve years of absence, he returned home with a retinue of twelve thousand disciples, Rabbi Akiba overheard a conversation between his wife and a stranger, who chided her for her folly in marrying a man who had neglected her for so long a time. Her only reply was that if it were up to her, she would have been willing to let him tarry another twelve years. Rabbi Akiba took the hint, and when he came back twelve years later with twice twelve thousand pupils following him and she went out to meet him and fell at his feet and his disciples made a move to push her aside on account of such unseemly conduct in public, he held them back. "Let her be," said he. "Whatever I or you may have accomplished is due entirely to her self-sacrifice." SHELI WESHELAKEM SHELAH HU.[16]

It is hard to say how much of this tradition is fact and how much is fiction, the product of poetic fancy. That there are in it features that smack of the legendary is clear. There exists no reason to doubt the assertion that Rabbi Akiba had many disciples. But that their number reached twenty-four thousand is obviously a hyperbole, a rhetorical exaggeration. This much, however, may safely be inferred from the romance between Rabbi Akiba and Rachel, namely, that he had a very devoted wife, and that she had been in a large measure responsible for his intellectual development, and that he always remained grateful to her for the loyalty she had displayed to him during the days of his obscurity when he first set out toward his goal and suffered dire poverty. This devotion on her part toward an ignorant rustic who had so little to offer her may have been an important factor in the improvements that the later legislator and jurist Rabbi Akiba proposed in the status of the Jewish woman by permitting the wife to keep her earnings when they exceeded the allowance that her husband was able to afford.[17]

Another version of how the erstwhile swain of the Palestinian countryside was transformed into the student who gained recognition as the keenest mind of his time was that once—he was then already forty years old—when he was tending the sheep in the field, he noticed by the well from which he was accustomed to water his flock a stone that had been worn away by the constant dripping of the water, and something began to stir in his dull and sluggish peasant mind. He said to himself: "If water, which is so soft, can vanquish stone, which is so hard, how much more powerful must be the impression of the Torah, the words of which are like iron, upon my heart, which consists of flesh and blood?" And so he decided there and then to go to school and study. He entered the elementary grade together with his young son of school age, reading out of the same primer and writing out together with him the letters of the Hebrew alphabet.[18] How difficult it must have been at his age to master the art of reading and writing one can very well imagine. Has it not been said that teaching an old man, or rather an adult, whose mind is no longer fresh, is like writing on a blotted sheet?[19] But Akiba had perseverence and patience and grit, and by dint of these qualities he not only perfected himself in these skills but soon outstripped all his masters.

His first mentor in the precepts of Judaism was Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrkanos, one of the most distinguished disciples of the celebrated Rabban Jochanan ben Zakkai and particularly noted for his extraordinarily retentive memory. For a number of years his teacher took hardly any notice of him, until one day Rabbi Akiba startled him by a successful refutation of an opinion that this master had expressed, something that the latter had not at all expected from such a quarter.[20] Hereupon Rabbi Eliezer's colleague Rabbi Joshua, another one of Akiba's teachers, mockingly cited to Rabbi Eliezer the verse from Judges: "is not this the people that thou hast despised? Go out now, pray, and fight with it."[21]

From that moment on Rabbi Akiba was recognized as a full-fledged member of the academy, which constituted also the Sanhedrin, the ruling body in Jewry. He was acknowledged as one of the "armor bearers" (Ba'alei Tereissin), the peer of his teachers,[22] whom he soon exceeded by the trenchant logic of his reasoning and the originality of his method in expounding the text of the Bible. Before he appeared on the scene, the innumerable oral traditions pertaining to Jewish practice and belief that had accumu-

lated thru the ages, such as the rules of slaughtering, the architecture of the booths in which Jews were bidden to dwell on the feast of tabernacles, the form of the phylacteries and the types of labor forbidden on the Sabbath, all the traditions pertaining to these matters lay about in profusion and disorder, so that it was almost impossible for any person to commit them all to memory. Akiba came along and with his master mind established order out of chaos. It was he who set up the framework of the Mishnah with its six orders embracing agricultural laws, regulations concerning the festivals, women's rights, civil and criminal jurisprudence, sacrificial and purity laws, with their divisions and their subdivisions into tractates and chapters. It was from him also that the most important early Jewish Bible commentaries are said to have emanated.[23] Much that had been obscure in the hereditary teachings was clarified by him, so that often an explanation that had been forgotten by his elders was recalled to their memory by his subtle analysis.[24]

His greatest achievement, however, in the eyes of those nearest to him chronologically was the manner in which he found support in the Holy Scriptures for the time-honored customs of the Jewish people the origin of which was no longer known or had been lost in the confusion produced by the catastrophe that befell Jewry when the Romans crushed in blood the Jewish rebellion against them, destroyed the temple of Jerusalem, put an end to whatever was left of Jewish sovereignty and scattered the greater portion of the Jewish survivors of the war to the four winds. There was danger, indeed, that the Torah, the sole bond that remained to unite them, would be forgotten. Thanks to Rabbi Akiba this did not happen. He strengthened the thin fibres, he reinforced the threads, and thus anchored the oral law securely in the written.

The method he pursued herein was simply this.[25] Every word of the Torah, he declared, every letter of Sacred Writ had a meaning. There was nothing superfluous or redundant in the divinely revealed book. Man may be careless in his speech. God is not. Every seeming repetition to be found in the Pentateuch must, therefore, have a purpose. Every iota that is not needed to indicate the sense of a scriptural passage must possess an implication. There is, for example, that untranslatable Hebrew particle ET that is employed in the Bible before nouns in the accusative defined by the article. Now this particle ET may also be and is, therefore, rendered by him as meaning "with." Thus, when

the Bible states that God created ET HASHAMAYIM WE'ET HA'ARETZ,[26] it wishes to convey the thought that He made something together with the heaven and the earth, not heaven and earth only. This word ET contains also the answer to the riddle of how the human race was propagated since Adam and Eve bore only two sons, Kain and Abel.[27] It indicates that together with each of them was born an unnamed twin sister whom each was permitted to marry since the prohibition against such incestuous unions had not yet been promulgated.

This ingenious method, which he elaborated, he had acquired from a sage by the name of Nahum of Gimzo.[28] It didn't however, always work out satisfactorily. As happens so often when a rule is carried to its logical conclusion, so also in this case was complete consistency apt to lead to absurd results. The particle ET is, for instance, also employed in the command to fear God.[29] But there it could manifestly not be construed as "with," because God claims the exclusive worship of His followers and brooks no association or partnership. On this account Nahum of Gimzo was ready to abandon his method of interpretation. But Rabbi Akiba came to the rescue and resolved the difficulty by explaining that what was meant was that the disciples of the wise, i.e., the scholars who made the study of the Law of God their vocation, were also deserving of reverence.[30]

Rabbi Akiba's legal theory distinguished itself by its realism, i.e., its hard, uncompromising logic, its imperturbable adherence to fact. Reason, he felt, can give no quarter. "No mercy is to be shown in judgment" [31] was his motto. "Let justice pierce the mountain." [32] Thus he held that possession was nine tenths of the law, and that the burden of proof rested, therefore, always on the claimant, not the actual owner or holder.[33] Applied to the Jewish homeland, the consequence of this rule was that Palestine was to be considered holy and, therefore, subject to the special agricultural laws pertaining to Jewish property in it, such as the priestly tithes and the gifts to the poor, only so long as it was actually under Jewish jurisdiction and not otherwise.[34] When in any given case an indefinite amount is mentioned in a legal code, it is the minimum, not the maximum construction that must be put upon it.[35] Thus, when it is stated in the Torah that a king may not take unto himself a plural number of wives, what is meant is that he may not have any more than one, for even two could be construed as constituting "many." [36] The plebeian Akiba tried to be as fair to

the rich, the land-owners, as he was to the poor, for whose maintenance special provisions were laid down in Holy Writ;[37] and while on the one hand he appeared to be rather lenient in the matter of divorce,[38] permitting a husband to put away his wife for the sake of someone prettier than she, he was most severe in punishing the slightest infraction of sexual morality to the point of declaring illegitimate the offspring of any forbidden union.[39]

Rabbi Akiba's religious philosophy was characterized by the same clarity of thought as his legal theory. Of the four sages of his time who are reported to have indulged in speculation about the ultimate truths he was the only one who is alleged to have come thru the experience unscathed.[40] Among the problems that he may have pondered in the course of this investigation was the one concerning man's freedom of choice and God's foreknowledge of events. If the human being is to be rewarded for his good behavior and to be punished for his misdeeds on earth by the heavenly judge, it is necessary that he possess the ability to choose the one way or the other. For if he were merely to follow his inborn nature, if he were to act in accordance with instinct like the lower animals, there would be no reason for holding him responsible for his deeds since they would in that case not be dictated by his own will but by a preordained necessity, by a fate over which he has no control. Man's conduct cannot be expected to be moral unless it be guaranteed that he is the captain of his soul. Now, however, the admission that man has such complete mastery over the choice of his way of life automatically limits the knowledge and the power of God, who is asserted by the Jewish creed to be all-knowing and all-powerful, inasmuch as a certain area—that of human behavior—is thereby left undetermined. The contradiction between the principle of man's freedom of choice, which is the basis of morality, on the one hand, and the divine ruler's omniscience and omnipotence, which is required by monotheism, on the other, has been one of the rocks against which all philosophers since the beginning of philosophic thinking have stumbled and which until today none of them has been successful in removing without falling into either a hopeless fatalism that spells the deathknell of morality by declaring futile any attempt to improve the human lot, or into atheism which denies the existence of a providence that guides and controls the universe. Anxious to evade both these extremes Rabbi Akiba—and nearly all Jewish thinkers after him—simply allowed the contradiction to stand. "Although all is

foreseen," said he, "yet is choice given to man." [41] "Everything is in the hands of heaven," whatever befalls man is decreed from above. There is, however, one exception to this rule—"the fear of heaven." [42]

Rabbi Akiba is not known to have held any public office except for that of overseer over the poor, in connection with which he is said to have done a considerable amount of travelling for the purpose of collecting funds.[43] Yet such was the prestige he carried and the authority he wielded and so highly was his judgment esteemed by his contemporaries that no official act affecting the welfare of the Jewish people was carried out and no decision of public importance was made without him. If a delegation had to be sent to Rome to intercede with the government on behalf of the Jewish community, he was appointed a member of it.[44] If an extra month had to be added to the year in order to equalize the discrepancies between the solar and the lunar calendar and the ceremony had to be performed outside the confines of the Roman empire, because it constituted, on account of the effect of such an act on the payment of taxes, an arrogation of autonomy which conflicted with the authority of Rome, Rabbi Akiba was charged with the mission.[45] His good sense, his evenness of temper, his unassuming modesty and his conciliatory nature caused him to be chosen very often for the delicate task of peacemaker when the upflare of passions and the clash of temperaments threatened to disrupt the unity of Jewish life—and there were in this turbulent period of Jewish history many occasions on which his services of conciliator were required.

The era into which most of Akiba's activities fell was that following the destruction of the second temple. He was probably already a grown man when that tragic event took place, but, as it has been noted previously, he did not become a figure in Jewish intellectual or political circles until he was in his fifties at least. At that time the aged Rabban Jochanan ben Zakkai, who had founded the school at Jabneh and had reconstituted thru it Jewish authority, was already dead. The position of president of the Sanhedrin was occupied by Gamaliel II, a descendant of Hillel and a son of one of the leaders of the Judean insurrection against Rome. Anxious to prevent factionalism and the schisms, that had contributed so much to the Jewish disaster and would certainly have meant, now that the Palestinian Jewish community was bereft of its political independence, the complete undoing of the Jewish

people, Rabban Gamaliel decided to rule with an iron hand and to establish certain rules or norms with which he expected everybody to conform.[46] However, when he attempted to impose his will on his colleagues, a goodly number of whom were his superiors intellectually, he ran into difficulty. It once happened, for example, that, as a result of incorrect testimony, he had fixed the wrong day as the New Year, and when one of the members of the Sanhedrin, Rabbi Joshua, objected to his ruling, he ordered him to appear on the day, which according to his (i.e., Rabbi Joshua's) calculation was the Day of Atonement, in court with his staff and wallet. How the sage must have felt when compelled to desecrate what was the holiest day of the year according to his computation can well be imagined. Yet, when he consulted Rabbi Akiba as to what to do, the latter counselled him for the sake of harmony to yield to the authority of the Nassi, supporting his stand with a verse of the Bible which seems to give the right to fix the calendar, although it be based on a false assumption, to the constituted authorities in Jewry.[47]

Such instances of the humiliation of the most revered members of the academy by the president occurred, however, again and again until the scholars could stand it no longer and a revolt broke out, resulting in the removal of Rabban Gamaliel from office. His fall from grace sobered the imperious, although well-meaning head of Palestinian Jewry and made him realize his mistakes, so much so that he not only continued to frequent the academy as he had been wont to do theretofore but he even apologized to Rabbi Joshua and asked him to forgive him for the anguish he had caused him. No one was happier over the reconciliation of the leaders than Rabbi Akiba; and just as he had been foremost among those who had deposed Rabban Gamaliel on account of the latter's arrogance, so was he the first to see to it that he was reinstated in office when it had become clear that he had seen the error of his ways.[48]

These internal differences and difficulties were, however, mere trifles in comparison with the mountains of trouble that come upon the Jewish community of Palestine in this unhappy century from without. The destruction of the temple and the subjugation of Judea by the Roman emperor Vespasian and his son and successor Titus had been a sad enough blow for Jewry. Yet after they had accomplished their purpose and attained their objective of breaking the back of Jewish resistance to Rome and of depriving Jews of their autonomy, the rule of the conquerors over those of the

conquered who submitted to their will was comparatively mild. The Jews of Palestine were not interfered with so far as the observance of their religion was concerned thruout the reigns of Vespasian and Titus. When Titus died, however, the reins of government fell into the hands of his brother Domitian, who was known as an inveterate Jew-hater, and it was to avert the effects of some of the anti-Jewish decrees that Rabbi Akiba went for the first time to Rome in the company of Rabban Gamaliel, Rabbi Eleazer the son of Azariah, and Rabbi Joshua the son of Hananiah, the other leaders of the Palestinian Jewish community.[49]

Luckily Domitian died while the Jewish notables were lingering in Rome, and a new emperor, more kindly disposed toward his Jewish subjects, acceded to the throne; and so the emissaries were able to return with the good news that the humiliating and onerous Jew's tax had been removed—"fisci Judaici sublata." Unfortunately Nerva's tenure of office was of but very brief duration. After a reign of little over a year he was succeeded by Trajan, who in turn was followed by Hadrian, and the decades of their rule were filled with bloody persecutions and bitter oppression so far as the Jews were concerned. First—this happened during the regime of Trajan—the Jews of North Africa, i.e., of Cyrenaica and Egypt as well as those of Crete and Parthia rose in rebellion. Later on, under Hadrian, insurrection broke out in Palestine, largely on account of the failure on the part of the emperor to make good his promise to allow the Jews to rebuild their sanctuary, and his erection instead, on the site of the Jewish national shrine, of a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus. In retaliation for the insubordination of the Jews, many tenets of the Jewish faith—particularly the rite of circumcision, which was prohibited under Roman law as a mutilation of the human body from which Jews had been exempted by special enactment—were now proscribed.[50] The executions on account of disregard by Jews of the government's edicts must have become so numerous that the leaders of Jewry feared the complete disappearance of the Jewish stock and it became necessary to adopt some definite measures for coping with the emergency. It was the view of Rabbi Akiba that in order to conserve Jewish lives it would be advisable, temporarily at least, to waive the precepts of the Torah. Only in regard to three fundamental laws of Judaism should Jews prefer death to transgression, namely when ordered to commit incest, murder, or idolatry. Should it happen, however, that a certain commandment be made a

test-case of Jewish loyalty, then no matter how unimportant it might be it serves as a justification for the endurance of martyrdom.[51]

For more than a decade beginning with about 118 C.E. Jews thus suffered in silence. But finally the patience of the persecuted people burst. Once more Jews cast off the hated Roman yoke. Under the leadership of an otherwise unknown military chieftain by the name of Bar Kochba, who had coins struck in his name, they held out for three years against the mighty legions of Rome. Their last fortress, that of Bettar, did not fall into the hands of the Roman general Severus until the year 135, and when it did, it was chiefly as a result of treachery.[52]

What part Rabbi Akiba played in this rebellion is not entirely clear. Tradition records [53] that when he met Bar Kochba, he hailed him as the Messiah, applying to him the verse: "There shall step forth a star out of Jacob." [54] That might indicate that he gave his moral support to the revolution, but it does not yet constitute sufficient proof that either he or his pupils participated actively in the military campaign. The martyr's death that was decreed for him and that ended his rich and colorful career was in punishment of a religious rather than a political offense. So long as the edicts of the government affected only the observance of ritual the now aged leader counselled his Jewish countrymen submission to force majeure. Important though it was to comply with the commandments of God, the suspension for the duration of the emergency of Jewish practices could not affect Jewish survival. When, however, the teaching of Torah, upon which the very continuance of Judaism depended, when that too was forbidden, then he was no longer able to yield. So he came out into open and boldly defied the rulings of the emperor.[55] It did not take very long, of course, before he was arrested and sentenced to die admidst horrible tortures. While in prison he met for the second time an assimilationist Jew by the name of Pappos, who had previously warned him against what he had regarded as rashness. When this Pappos had cautioned him against the danger to which he was wantonly exposing himself by violating the prohibition of the teaching of the Torah, Rabbi Akiba had cited as an answer the fable of the fox and the fishes. A fox, walking along the bank of a river one day noticed that the fishes were scurrying away in great haste. Said he to them: "Why are you running away, oh ye fishes?" And they replied: "We are trying to elude the fishermen's nets." "Then why not come up on land so we could all live together in peace and harmony," asked the fox. And the

fishes answered: "Art thou Renard, the fox, who is reputed to be the cleverest of all the beasts? Verily thou art nought but a fool. If even here in the water, which is our element, our breath of life, the air that we inhale, we do not feel entirely safe, how much worse off would we be on land where we would be lacking the very essentials of existence?" If Jews are in trouble even whilst they engage in the study of the Torah, which is the cause of Israel's longevity and its survival, how much more desperate would their plight be if they were to give up their preoccupation therewith. Aye nothing could hasten the end more effectively than such a spiritually suicidal step.

Some time must have elapsed between Rabbi Akiba's arrest and the execution of sentence, for it is related that he continued to instruct his pupils even while in prison.[56] The sage, who had never interrupted his studies in the house of study in order to spend the evening with his family, except on the eve of Passover, in order that he might be able to celebrate that festival before the children had gone to bed, and on the eve of the Day of Atonement, so that he could give his little ones their evening meal before the fast began,[57] would certainly not discontinue his teaching activities whilst in involuntary confinement so long as he could help it. So he went on enlightening those who consulted him on various points of Jewish law, and, when direct contact was no longer possible, a certain Rabbi Jochanan, the shoemaker, is said to have disguised himself as a street-vendor, and, passing up and down the street in front of the jail, to have cried: "Who wants pins? Who wants needles? If a woman performed the rite of levirate marriage in private, is the act valid?" And Rabbi Akiba, putting his head out of the window, retorted: "Have you any spindles? Have you any . . . . It is valid." [58]

Rabbi Akiba, who must now have attained a hoary old age, demeaned himself in his final agony as courageously and bravely as he had borne himself thruout his long life. The torments to which the cruel Roman executioners subjected him did not avail to break his spirit. Joyfully did he bring his life as a sacrifice to his maker. When his pupils, seeing him in travail, asked him: "Master, must a person endure all this for the sake of his faith?" [59] he replied: "All life long I have been waiting for the opportunity to fulfill the commandment of 'thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all . . . . thy life,' [60] but it never came. Now, that the occasion has presented itself, shall I not rejoice?" And so with

the Shema' on his lips, he breathed his last, expiring as he pronounced the word ECHAD (one) in the verse: "Hear, oh Israel, the Lord, our God, the Lord is (ECHAD) one." [61]

Thus died Akiba ben Joseph, the modest, the humble, the father of rabbinic Judaism who never hesitated to retract his view in favor of the opinion of a colleague when analysis showed that the latter had a stronger case,[62] and who put himself lower than a shepherd when he was berated by one who disagreed with him.[63] Thus passed away the tender-hearted teacher, who used to visit his pupils in their illness when no one else came to see them,[64] and who was most grateful for any sympathy shown him in his own bereavement.[65] Till the very last he, who had been the witness of so much misfortune, retained his optimism, his faith in the ultimate redemption of his people. Aye in the very trials of Jewry and the desolation of the Holy City which made his colleagues weep he found confirmation of the certainty of final salvation.[66]

This spirit could not help leaving its impress on contemporaries and posterity alike. It must have contributed enormously to Jewish survival. But whatever the forces may have been that kept Jewry from succumbing in the crisis that it faced in the days of Rabbi Akiba, this much is certain, namely, that thousands of Jews continued to labor on the spiritual edifice of which he had laid the foundation, and which is today the inalienable heritage of the congregation of Jacob.

FROM MOSES TO MOSES

Ever since the decease on December 13, 1204, of the man whose position in the history of philosophy is to be the subject of this paper, there has been current among his Jewish admirers the dictum that "from Moses (the son of Amram) to Moses (the son of Maimun) there has not arisen one like unto him." This epigram sums up in a single sentence Jewry's estimate of the worth and the achievements of Moses Maimonides. And it is a justified verdict, for the precocious Jewish lad of Cordova who grew into the sage of Fostat, the Spanish exile whose fame as a healer was so great that it reached even the ears of the celebrated Saladin so that he attached him to his household as court-physician, the foreigner whom the Jewish community of Egypt chose to be its chief arbiter in matters secular as well as spiritual, the student of the Talmud whom contemporary Jewry recognized as its foremost legal authority, the thinker whom the scientific world of his day esteemed as one of the leading metaphysicians of all times, was by far the most universal scholar, the profoundest intellect and the most constructive genius that the Jewish race had produced. Since Moses the lawgiver there had not been seen his equal in Israel. That is why today his coreligionists throughout the world offer up incense to his name. But it is not for Jews alone to do homage to the memory of Moses Maimonides. Non-Jews, too, whether Christian or Mohammedan, and even those who subscribe to neither of these two faiths, have reason to participate in the festivities commemorative of the birth of this Jewish giant of the spirit, for Maimonides did not belong to the Jewish people alone, nor did he derive all his greatness solely from his race. He absorbed knowledge from every available source. He produced fruits that were edible to all men. He took from the world and gave to the world and, therefore, because the world has a share in the legacy he has left to posterity, it behooves the world to take note of him who bequeathed it.

It is not the function of this essay to present a biography of Moses Maimonides,[1] but merely to indicate his place in the chain of systematic thinking that extends unbroken from the time of the philosophers of ancient Greece down to our own day. Yet it would

be impossible to take full stock of Maimonides' contribution to philosophy without paying attention to certain salient factors of his life and surroundings which must indubitably have greatly conditioned his intellectual development. For, just as the evolution of plants, the stature and beauty they attain, depends to a large extent upon soil and climate, so every human genius is a child of his age and environment which determine the degree of his growth and also set his limitations. Plato and Aristotle, Spinoza and Kant were no doubt all of them creative minds of the highest calibre, original thinkers who blazed new trails in the realm of philosophical inquiry. Yet great as must have been their intrinsic merit, unique as they were each one of them in his day, it is equally certain that out of their setting they could not have become what they were. Only a sophisticated cultured Athens with a tradition of speculative thinking of several centuries could have produced a Plato. Aristotle could not have carried on his extensive experiments, which made possible his marvelous synthesis, without the vast resources of the Macedonian empire in which he resided. Spinoza's boldness was due in a great measure to his living during an era of enlightenment, when traditional notions were thrown into the discard, as Kant's profundity was nourished by the intellectual ferment of the Germany of the 18th century. The same holds true for Maimonides. He was, in his greatness as well as his shortcomings, a product of his antecedents and his milieu. His mastery of Jewish religious literature he owed to his descent from a long line of rabbis; his love of knowledge in general—to the fact that he was reared in Moorish Spain which, prior to the invasion of the fanatical Almohades, that was responsible for the banishment of his family from their native Cordova when he was but thirteen years of age, was a seat of culture and learning, a culture in which Jews and Moslems collaborated equally and which about the time of Maimonides' birth had attained an excellence which was never again to be reached by the Arabic-speaking world. His almost unqualified acceptance of the scientific as well as the metaphysical doctrines of Aristotle, whose authority he regarded as infallible for everything beneath the moon, is to be ascribed to the absolute sway which the system of the Stagirite had attained in the learned world of his day, thanks to the labors of Alfarabi and Ibn Sina thru whose works Maimonides became acquainted with the views of the Greek philosopher.[2] His religious orthodoxy, again, which drove him to seek a compromise between Judaism

and Greek philosophy, was due to the fact that he lived in an age in which the church, whether Jewish, Christian or Mohammedan, reigned supreme and free thought was the exception rather than the rule.

Such were the circumstances that were responsible for the particular development that the genius of Maimonides underwent, and in evaluating his intellectual achievements we must bear them in mind for without that the phenomenon that is Moses Maimonides would be absolutely incomprehensible.

To proceed now to a consideration of the position of Moses Maimonides in the history of philosophy, let it be made clear at the outset that he was not primarily a metaphysician like his Mohammedan contemporary and fellow-countryman, who like himself was a native of Cordova, Averroes, but first and foremost a theologian. The purpose of his chief philosophical work "The Guide of the Perplexed" was not speculative. It was intended to be exactly what its title implies: a beacon-light, an ensign pointing the right way to those whom the study of philosophy had caused to become spiritually confused and swerve from the beaten track of religion. The Jewish Aristotle proposed in this magnum opus of his to effect a harmonization between two different, oft-opposing, systems of thought rather than to inaugurate an entirely new structure of his own.[3] He did it by attempting to demonstrate that there is no conflict between Judaism's revelation, when properly understood, and the ripest fruits of human reason, which in his opinion were represented by the teachings of Aristotle as interpreted by the Arabic commentators. By Judaism properly understood Maimonides meant the Jewish creed rationalized and explained in the light of current scientific and philosophic conceptions. Such a rationalization is partly carried out in the "Guide." The author points to the fact that certain passages in the Bible in which God is spoken of as walking and talking, possessing hands and feet, ears and a mouth and other such human attributes, could not possibly have been meant literally, but that these locutions were just figures of speech which are often employed by men in referring to things abstract that cannot be exactly defined by human language.[4] If this holds true in some instances in which the metaphorical significance is evident, it may apply also to others in which it is not so obvious. Skillfully employing this method of exegesis Maimonides finds in the Hebrew Scriptures support for the Aristotelian dichotomy of reality into *matter* and *form,* for the

resolution of all physical substances into the four elements of *earth, water, air* and *fire* and other metaphysical and scientific ultimates of his day. The all-too-human God of the literal version of Jewish Sacred Writ becomes abstracted into the *prime mover* who sets the processes of the universe agoing as the loved object attracts the lover. He is pure Spirit, simple, incorporeal, possessed of no human affections or attributes. The true comprehension of His essence is impossible for the human mind. The only assertions that can be made of Him are negations, i.e., when it is said God is omnipotent what is meant is not that He possesses physical power to perfection but that weakness does not appertain to him. Thus for God. As for the angels that are mentioned in the Bible they become either the *separate intelligences,* the spiritual beings that were thought by the medieval metaphysicians to be the movers of the heavenly spheres or the word "mal'akh" may stand for any one of the elements of nature that God uses as the instruments of His will. The apparitions of the prophets, too, lose their substantiality. They become phantasmagoria, visions present only in the minds of those that see them, who at the moment are in a sort of hypnotic state.

In this way Judaism was accommodated to the teachings of science. And yet with all the revamping of the traditional creed that Maimonides had thus performed with the skill of a master and in the utmost sincerity some gaps remained, as they were bound to remain, between a national creed like that of Israel and so universal a system as Aristotle's was, and no amount of interpretation, however ingenious and clever, could explain them away. For example the Bible posits the belief that the world was created, while Aristotle holds that it existed since eternity. Judaism asserts that God's providence extends to every living creature. The Greek philosopher, however, claims that He is indifferent. The Jewish Scriptures speak of miracles which constitute suspensions of the laws of nature. Such a view is entirely contrary to the scientific temper of the Stagirite. These doctrines that we have mentioned were regarded as basic to the Jewish religion, and to nullify them by means of exegesis would have been tantamount to cutting out the vitals from the Judaic creed. How did Maimonides solve this problem? He subjected the divergent teachings of Aristotle to a rigid critical analysis. He proved, using Aristotle's own propositions as premises, that the world must have been created in time. This conclusion, he asserts, is not necessitated by the statement of

the Bible, which might be interpreted if necessary to fit Aristotle's view. It is required by the demands of science. Now if God could create a world at a certain definite time just because He willed it, He should also be able to perform miracles reversing the ordinary processes of nature. Maimonides disagrees with Aristotle in the matter of God's providence, stating that, although the philosopher may be right insofar as the individuals of the lower species are concerned, when it comes to man, he must part company with him. With all his reverence for the Greek master his Jewish disciple does not find it possible to follow him everywhere. He considers him a pretty safe guide for the sublunar world, but above the moon he is no longer trustworthy.

Such is the tenor of Maimonides' philosophical masterpiece the Guide of the Perplexed, the manner in which he reconciles Judaism with Aristotle. He was neither the first nor the last to do it. He had his forerunners as well as his successors in this effort. None of them, however, performed the task as consummately, as masterfully and completely as he did it. With the thoroughness that was characteristic of Aristotle, to whom he felt so much akin, he starts out in every investigation by presenting the views of his predecessors and pointing out their flaws. Then, after having cleared the ground, he states his own thesis. Thanks to this method of his the modern world is, as David Kaufmann remarks, in possession of a very clear expose of the metaphysical systems of the early Mohammedan theologians, the doctrines of the Mutakallimun for which Maimonides' Guide of the Perplexed is the most reliable source.[5] We are indebted to him also for a mass of information about the superstitious and idolatrous practices of his day, especially those of the Sabians, with whose rites and literature he shows himself thoroughly familiar. His conclusions regarding the origins of the Jewish ceremonial laws come very close to the findings of modern anthropologists and the theories of present-day historians of religion, whilst his analysis of the phenomenon of prophecy is worthy of a William James or a Freud.

One may agree or disagree with Maimonides. One cannot help being fascinated by him for he is always illuminating and stimulating. This fact was quickly recognized by his contemporaries, gentile as well as Jewish, and accounts for the rapid dissemination of the Guide. The book, written in Arabic, which its author had purposely caused to be copied in Hebrew characters in order to confine it to Jewish readers, had scarcely made its appearance in the

world, than it was transcribed into Arabic letters and eagerly studied in Mohammedan universities.[6] Before a decade and a half had passed it enjoyed a Hebrew translation—in and by itself quite an undertaking since the philosophical terms in which the original was to be rendered had first to be invented. This translation brought the philosophical teachings of Maimonides within the reach of thousands of Jews living in non-Arabic speaking countries. Before the end of the first quarter of the 13th century there were already in existence versions of the Guide in Latin, the universal language of the Catholic church and the medium of its theologians and savants. The writings of such scholastics as William of Auvergne and Alexander of Hales already contain references to the philosophical theories of Rabbi Moyses, the wisest of the Jews residing among the Saracens, while the greatest teachers of the medieval church, the learned Dominican Albertus Magnus and his even greater pupil Thomas Aquinas, in whom scholasticism attained the zenith of its development, quote him profusely and incorporate whole sections of the Guide in their theological compendiums.[7] It is interesting to note that one of these Christian disciples of the Jewish rabbi, the Dominican William of Auvergne, personally participated in the burning of Maimonides' books, which were destroyed together with the Talmud in his episcopate of Paris. Yet he had no scruples against quoting him and thus preserving in his own writings in Latin what he had consigned to the flames in Hebrew. It is interesting but not at all surprising because the scaffolding erected by Rabbi Moses the Egyptian to bolster up Judaism was indispensable to the teachers of the medieval church. The need for a reconciliation with Aristotle was as great with Christians as it was with Jews, and, since the points in which the teachings of the two faiths differed from those of the Stagirite were essentially the same, it was but logical that the former should adopt the defense set up by the latter. Rightly has it been said by Emile Saisset that "Maimonides is the precursor of Saint Thomas Aquinas and that the Guide of the Perplexed announces and prepares the Summa Theologiae."

Such was the fame and the vogue achieved by the literary monument of Maimonides' speculative genius during the century following the death of its author. It had become a textbook of philosophy not for Jews alone but for Christians and Moslems as well, being quoted for corroboration or disagreement, admired and fought about, pondered and contested. In the 14th century

with the decline of culture among Jews, its almost total eclipse among Moslems and the tendency towards mysticism among the doctors of the Church, the preoccupation with Maimonides' Guide diminishes. Jews still write commentaries on it and develop or combat its philosophical theories. Mohammedans, however, hardly mention it and the references to it in Christian works become rarer and rarer. With the revival of learning during the two succeeding centuries, generally known as the renaissance, the name of Maimonides again looms up outside of Jewish literature. John Reuchlin, the celebrated German humanist, the contemporary of Martin Luther and defender of the Talmud against the attacks of the Obscurantists, knows of his work. The great French jurist and political philosopher of the 16th century, Jean Bodin, who was one of the outstanding scholars of his day, read the Guide of the Perplexed carefully, used it extensively and recognized its author as his teacher and guide. His countryman, Joseph Scaliger, one of the greatest and most versatile philologians, not only of his epoch, but of all time, knew the Guide in its Latin and Hebrew versions as well as in the original Arabic in which it had been composed, and in a letter to the eminent French critic Casaubon stated that its greatness could not be praised sufficiently.

However it was first in the 17th century, the age of reason, that the Jewish rationalist of the 12th found his real spiritual heir in another Jew, sprung from stock originating from the same country in which he was born. I refer to the humble lense-grinder and brilliant thinker of Amsterdam, Benedict Spinoza. The Guide of the Perplexed of Rabbi Moses ben Maimon was not only the first philosophical text to be studied by the first truly modern philosopher, who thru it was initiated into the world of metaphysics. It remained an abiding influence, the effects of which can be traced thruout his works. Spinoza himself is, to be sure, loathe to acknowledge his indebtedness to the sage of Fostat whom he uses quite frequently as the butt of his criticism particularly in his theologico-political treatise.[8] This circumstance should not, however, blind one to the really intimate connection existing between the philosophical systems of these two thinkers. Aristotle, also, often took exception to the views of his teacher Plato from whom he diverged considerably, and yet, for all the differences between them, the resemblance between master and pupil is unmistakable. So is it also with Spinoza in relation to Maimonides. He disagrees and yet agrees with him. Both Maimonides and Spinoza were ra-

tionalists. Both regarded the intellectual love of God, amor intellectualis dei, as the summun bonum, the end and goal of human striving. Both subordinated morality to knowledge considering the former as a preparatory stage to the latter, yet issuing from it, for "when men know what is good for them, they will do it." The cause of most human misfortunes, Spinoza asserted with Maimonides, was ignorance. The world would not seem half so wrong if men would only live according to its laws. These are some of the points that Maimonides and Spinoza have in common. But their relation extends further. It can be noted even where they disagree. If the philosopher of Amsterdam with his thoroughgoing naturalistic conception of the universe denies to the human being freedom of will, stating that man's actions are predetermined, the Rabbi of Cairo while affirming this dogma of Judaism does it with the reservation that the reconciliation of man's freedom of will with the foreknowledge of God is a mystery which has not yet been solved. If Spinoza the Pantheist, who identifies God with the world, does away with the belief in Providence and counsels those who would be happy to live in accordance with the laws of nature, Maimonides who must perforce cling to a personal God informs us that the amount of attention that a human being can receive from Providence depends upon the stage of his intellectual development, and that the individuals of the lower species do not secure it at all. Finally let it be remembered that Maimonides' God is as abstract and as free from human affections as is Spinoza's Deus sive Natura, and that both claim that an adequate conception by man of the essence of deity is impossible.

From Spinoza Leibnitz, the foremost philosopher of the generation following, learned about Maimonides and his Guide. He not only studied this book but also annotated it and recommended it to be read by all thinking men. Leibnitz, who was in turn one of the most potent molding influences in the development of Kantian philosophy, accepted many of the doctrines of Maimonides, such as the one that this is the best of all possible worlds and that if God could create the world and stipulate its laws, He could also overthrow them at His will or at least include in His plan an occasional interruption of their course.

Considering to what extent a non-Jew of the calibre of Leibnitz drew upon Maimonidean philosophy, it is not at all astonishing that a Mendelssohn and a Solomon Maimon, both of them Jews who, like Spinoza, cut their philosophical teeth on the Guide of

the Cordovan, should have been influenced by him. But not only they but even Hegel,[9] who was still further removed from the Middle Ages and closer to our own time, spoke with respect about the learned Jew of Fostat whose "Guide" he characterized as a veritable treasure-house of metaphysical beauty and truth, and no less eminent a historian than the Swiss Von Mueller thought that the works of Maimonides ought to be translated into every modern language because "they are among the few books necessary for an understanding of present-day problems." This wish has been partially realized in the last and the present centuries during which adequate renderings into French, German, English, Hungarian, Italian and Spanish, based on the epoch-making edition of the original by Solomon Munk, have been prepared of the Guide of Maimonides, a book the author of which was born eight centuries ago but which, on account of the eternal truths that it contains, has not yet lost its usefulness but maintains until this day an honored place in the history of philosophy.

A GIFT TO FRANCE

The year 5700 marked the 900th anniversary of the birth of that most beloved Jewish commentator, Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac, or as he is popularly known, Rashi. In delineating his personality one cannot escape the impulse to contrast it with that of that other great Jewish luminary of the Middle Ages, Moses Maimonides. Compared with this intellectual giant of Sephardic Jewry, who was equipped with universal knowledge and possessed broad interests, transcending the limits of Jewish lore, his French compeer was a sort of home-spun scholar, whose literary activities were confined to the proverbial "four ells" of Jewish tradition. This difference between the king of commentators, who was born and raised in Troyes, France,[1] and the codifier-philosopher of Fostat, Egypt, is indicated not only by the nature of the literary works they left behind, but by the very language in which these were executed and the sources on which they drew. Rashi's commentaries on the Bible and the Talmud were all of them written in Hebrew, the simple lucid Hebrew of the Mishnah intermingled with a few common terms of talmudic Aramaic. Maimonides, on the other hand, composed all his masterpieces, with the exception of his monumental code, the Yad Hachazakah, in Arabic, which, in the Arab-speaking world in which he lived, happened to be the vernacular as well as the language of erudition. The learning of the Frenchman Rashi, prodigious as it was—and his acquaintance with such matters as arts and crafts, geography, botany, and Hebrew grammar, aside from the Holy Scriptures and rabbinic literature, was really uncanny—was derived exclusively from Jewish books or personal observation. He never quotes a non-Jew either directly or indirectly. The author of the "Guide," however, is known definitely to have received instruction from gentile as well as Jewish masters, and he had no hesitancy, especially in his philosophic and scientific treatises, about citing the opinions of Greek and Mohammedan savants and expressing his approval of their views when he agreed with them.[2]

Because of the limited scope of Rashi's field of operation and the modesty of his aspirations—for he never cherished any ambitions beyond explaining to his Jewish pupils the two great monuments of the Jewish past, the Bible and the Talmud—it might be thought that the light of this unspoiled, native Jewish savant had

to be restricted to his own people, that its rays could never reach the world without. But this was precisely not the case. For not so very long after his death his famous comments on the Bible fell into the hands of a French monk by the name of Nicolas de Lyra, who made them the basis of his glosses on the Holy Scriptures,[3] and the work of Nicolas de Lyra, in which the name of Rabbi Solomon Isaacides is frequently mentioned, was in turn profusely utilized by the founder of Protestantism, Martin Luther, in his celebrated and epoch-making translation of the Bible into German from the original Hebrew—which by the way laid the foundations of modern German literature. Without the aid of de Lyra's glosses Luther's version of the Scriptures would not have come into being. For this we have the testimony of the bon mot, that later became current, "Si Lyra non lyrasset, Lutherius non saltasset," if Lyra had not sung, Luther would not have danced.[4]

The correct understanding of the Bible was, however, not the only service that Rashi rendered the outside world. Indirectly, without ever having intended it, this son of the ghetto, whose descendants were expelled from France at the very same time that representatives of the Church began to make use of his interpretations of the Bible, became the sole preserver for posterity of the French dialect used in his day.

This came about in the following manner. There occur in the Bible, and even more so in the Talmud, a great many names of household articles, plants, and animals, the meaning of which is not familiar to the average person. In explaining these terms Rashi, who was extremely economical with words—it is believed that ink was worth its weight in gold in his day[5]—saying only what was absolutely indipensable for the understanding of a passage, instead of resorting to long-winded descriptions, would very often indicate the meaning by giving the equivalent in the language of the land, the French tongue current among Jewish as well as non-Jewish inhabitants of France. Now it happens that the Jews were the only ethnic group living in France at the time that was literate. (We have it on good authority that business documents such as promissory notes, used to be drawn up in Hebrew during the period in question, in England as well as in France.)[6] Among non-Jews it was only the officials of the Church that knew how to read and write, and these usually wrote in Latin, not in the vernacular. The French glosses, or loazim as they are generally called, of which there are over 3000 in Rashi on the Bible and the Talmud and which non-French students of Rashi's commentaries find so

much difficulty in comprehending and even in pronouncing, are, therefore, the only written records of the speech prevalent in France in the eleventh century, the era of the trouvères who created the Chanson de Roland and others of the earliest works of French literature. And whoever wishes to trace the history of the French language is compelled to resort to the works of this unassuming, modest Jewish teacher who had never aspired to do anything other than to interpret the Bible and the Talmud to his own people.

Of course, to make these glosses of Rashi available and useful for the student of the history of the French language required a great deal of labor and scholarly research; for unfortunately the spelling of these words in manuscripts as well as printed texts is not in the best condition. The printers and copyists of later times, who knew no French, added mistake upon mistake, until the loazim became almost hopelessly confused. Furthermore, to render the task of deciphering still more difficult, these loazim were not provided with vowel-points, which the average Hebrew text usually lacks, with the result that the pronunciation would at best not be altogether certain. However, since the middle of the past century Jewish scholars like Arsene Darmsteter of Paris [7] and the late David Blondheim of Baltimore,[8] who were experts in Romance philology and at the same time well versed in rabbinic literature, succeeded by means of painstaking studies, on the basis of manuscript readings and consultation of the earliest printed editions (the commentary of Rashi on the Torah is the first Hebrew printed book the publication date of which is definitely known),[9] in reconstructing the correct readings of these glosses, which are now of invaluable assistance to all those who wish to know what the langue d'oui of the time was like. The loazim of Rashi will be incorporated in the monumental dictionary of Old French which Messrs. Tobler and Lommatzsch, both of them, ironically enough, outspoken Nazis, have been busy for decades in compiling.

This is how it came about that so thoroughly and genuinely Jewish a scholar as Rashi, who never ventured beyond the Bible and the Talmud, who paid no attention to any except Jewish lore, who never shone as an authority on any subject outside of biblical and rabbinic exegesis, became the resurrector of Old French, the sole means whereby Frenchmen of today, who are ready to oust Rashi's people from their land again as did their fathers before them, can become acquainted with the language spoken by their ancestors some 900 years ago.

THE MINNESINGER OF ZION

Of the long galaxy of distinguished Hebrew poets given forth by medieval Spanish Jewry none ever won a higher place in the affections of his people than Yehuda Halevi. That this favor was fully deserved by the Jewish bard of Toledo becomes apparent from even a cursory reading of the products of his poetic muse. They bubble over with so much love for Israel that it is not at all surprising that Israel should have taken their author to its heart, for there operates in the realm of love the same law of retaliation that obtains elsewhere. Tenderness begets tenderness. The poet, who said to Zion: "I am a harp for thy songs," [1] could not help becoming the most beloved of her minstrels.

Very little is known of the personal life of Yehuda Halevi.[2] All that can be set down with certainty is that he was born about the year 1086 C. E., in the city of Toledo, Spain, which was at the time under the rule of a Christian king, and that he was last heard of in Palestine about the year 1142; that he studied Talmud in Lucena under the celebrated Rabbi Isaac Alfasi; that he was a physician by profession; that his only child was a daughter who had a son named Judah like his grandfather, and that when he passed through Egypt on the way to the Holy Land, his visit resembled a triumphal procession on account of the enthusiastic reception accorded him by all sections of the population. Besides these few details it is only his views, his philosophy of Judaism, that are familiar to us through his matchless poems that have been preserved in the Machzorim of virtually every ritual, including that of the Karaites, as well as through his philosophical essay, the book Kusari, written in the Arabic language according to the custom of the age.

That Yehuda Halevi must have been a deeply religious person, a God-intoxicated Jew, is clear beyond the shadow of a doubt. It is evident from his statements in the dialogue between the Jewish scholar, who serves as his mouthpiece in the book Kusari, and the Chazar king. It exudes from such of his liturgical compositions as:

O Lord, where shall I find Thee?
All hidden and exalted is Thy place.
And where shall I not find Thee?
Full of Thy glory is the infinite space . . . .

Longing I sought Thy presence;
Lord, with my whole heart did I call and pray;
And going out toward Thee,
I found Thee coming to me on the way.[3]

Nevertheless it would be a mistake to picture Yehuda Halevi as an unworldly mystic, a sort of behind-the-oven type of Yeshivah student that still abounded in Eastern Europe a generation or so ago. For with all his deep piety the Hebrew poet laureate of the Middle Ages was a man of the world. His eyes were sensitive to the beauties of form. Nor was he a stranger to romantic love, as is proven by numerous love-songs emanating from him that have been transmitted to us. Aye, even in his old age—this happened during his sojourn in Egypt—he was able to write:

Wondrous is this land to see,
With perfume its meadows laden;
But more fair than all to me
Is yon slender, gentle maiden,
Ah, Time's swift flight I fain would stay,
Forgetting that my locks are gray.[4]

Yet whatever passions he may have nourished, the greatest of all was that for Zion. Externally his lyrics may perhaps be compared to those of the troubadours of Southern France, those wandering minstrels that travelled from court to court during the Middle Ages singing of their lady-love. However, the object of his affections was not, as Heinrich Heine aptly put it, "a Laura with beautiful eyes, or the mistress of a castle that presided over a tournament."

Jene die der Rabbi liebte [5]
War ein traurig, armes Liebchen,
Der Zerstoerung Jammerbildnis;
Und sie hiess Jerusalem.

(She who was by him beloved
Was a poor and tearful darling,
Mournful picture of destruction;
She was named Jerusalem.)

All life long Yehuda Halevi yearned for the privilege of treading the sacred soil of Israel's ancestral home. He was never happy as long as he was separated from the place to which he referred in his Kusari as "the heart of the world."

In the East, in the East, is my heart, and I dwell at the end of the West;
How shall I join in your feasting, how shall I share in your jest?

How shall my offerings be paid, my vows with performance be crowned,
While Zion pineth in Edom's bonds, and I am pent in Arab's bound?
All the beauties and treasures of Spain are worthless as dust in mine eyes,
But the dust of the Lord's ruined house, as a treasure of beauty I prize.[6]

Even more emphatically is this longing expressed in the following poem, which is believed to have been composed while the poet was on his way to Jerusalem:

Beautiful height! Oh joy! the whole world's gladness!
O great King's city, mountain blest!
My soul is yearning unto thee—is yearning
From limits of the west.
The torrents heave from depths of mine heart's passion,
At memory of thine olden state,
The glory of thee borne away in exile,
Thy dwelling desolate.
And who shall grant me, on the wings of eagles,
To rise and seek thee thru the years,
Until I mingle with thy dust, beloved,
The water of my tears?
I seek thee, though thy king be no more in thee,
Though where the balm hath been of old—
Thy Gilead's balm—be poisonous adders lurking,
Winged scorpions manifold.
Shall I not to thy very stones be tender?
Shall I not kiss them verily?
Shall not thine earth upon my lips taste sweeter
Than honey unto me?[7]

With so irresistible an urge drawing him Zionward it was impossible for Yehuda Halevi to maintain forever the contradiction between reality and the ideal, between what he had preached for years and actual practice. So, when he had already passed the age of "fifty,"[8] he took leave of family and friends in order to go in pursuit of his lady-love, Zion. It was by no means an easy thing at that time to carry out his life's ambition. It meant parting from his only child, the daughter whom he described as "the sister of his soul," and content himself with only the memory of his beloved grandson, "the child of his delight," who bore his own name—"How can Judah forget Judah?"[9] It involved not only sacrificing his earthly goods, to which he did not attach much value anyhow, but also giving up his peaceful life in the synagogue and the houses of study of his native land, as well as the circle of his friends and pupils whom he loved as though they were his own

children, in order to brave the perils of the sea which he has described most graphically. There were many among his acquaintances who sought to dissuade him from his undertaking. The land, they told him, was now a scene of desolation and ruin, the dwelling place of wild beasts. It was foolhardy to risk oneself in such a place. But the poet's only reply to these arguments was that, if it were so, "then the patriarchs, who had at one time lived there as strangers and had themselves been buried there, had sinned"; that although it be true that it was now "inhabited by wild beasts," it was in this very form that it had been given to the fathers—"all of her the heritage of thorns and thistles.[10] Yet they walked thru the length and breadth of her as one walketh in an orchard among green boughs. And there they walked before the Lord and learned the straight paths."

Thus he departed from Spain, borne as though it were "on eagles' wings," and when a storm would arise at sea and he felt sick and depressed, he would cheer himself with thoughts like the following, that have been immortalized in his deathless verses:

> The billows rage—exult oh Soul of mine,
> Soon shalt thou enter the Lord's sacred shrine.[11]

In this way, after many vicissitudes and wanderings, he finally arrived in the Holy Land, where he probably wrote that unforgettable ode to Zion that is still recited by Jews all over the world on the 9th of Ab, the day of the anniversary of the destruction of the Temple, and begins with the words:

> Zion! Wilt thou not ask if peace be with thy captives
> That seek thy peace—that are the remnants of thy flocks? [12]

Yehuda Halevi's end is shrouded in mystery. We do not know the circumstances of his death nor where he was buried. Legend has it that as he was bending low to kiss the dust of the Holy Land at the entrance of Jerusalem, a Saracen horseman, emerging from the city gate, trampled him to death, thus bringing to fruition his lifelong desire to be united with his lady-love. However, it really does not matter anymore today what became of the mortal, perishable portion of Yehuda Halevi, so long as we have with us the outpourings of his rich, sensitive Jewish soul, his poems which will live forever because they are filled with undying love for God and Israel.

NOTES

NOTES

RACE, NATIONALITY OR RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY

(1) Simon Dubnow, *Weltgeschichte des Juedischen Volkes,* Berlin 1928, VIII p. 86, 97ff.
(2) Quoted ibid. p. 135
(3) This theory was first propounded by Wilhelm Marr, an apostate Jew, in the year 1879. Viz. Dubnow, ibid., X p. 18ff.
(4) Viz. the notorious Nuremburg laws
(5) Maurice Fishberg, *Die Rassenmerkmale der Juden,* Munich 1913
(6) Ruth 4, 21. 22
(7) Babylonian Talmud Gittin 57b
(8) Mishnah Abot 1, 12
(9) Bab. T. Megillah 3a
(10) Ibid. Gittin 56a
(11) Ibid. Yebamot 79a
(12) We use the term "nationality" advisedly, for, as the late U. S. Supreme Court Justice Brandeis pointed out, complete nationhood implies sovereignty over a definite territory, which is something that the Jewish people cannot yet boast of
(13) Palestinian Talmud Bikkurim 64a Krotoschin edition
(14) Bab. T. Sanhedrin 27b
(15) Cf. David Philipson, *The Reform Movement in Judaism,* New York 1931, especially pp. 5 & 37
(16) Viz. Salo W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews,* New York 1937, I pp. 239 & 312
(17) See below
(18) Cf. the wellknown declaration in the festival liturgy of "Thou hast chosen us from among all peoples"
(19) E. g. Isaiah 42, 6
(20) Cf. any edition of the *Emunot We-De'ot* III, 7
(21) Jonah 1, 10
(22) Ibid.
(23) E. g. Mishnah Kiddushin 1, 9. Cf. *Jewish Encyclopedia,* London & New York 1906, *Palestine, Laws and Customs Relating to*
(24) Cf. J. E., *Sanhedrin*
(25) Jeremiah 29, 7

THE TRAIL OF THE REFUGEES

(1) Cf. any standard history of Europe
(2) Cf. Heinrich Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden* and Simon Dubnow
(3) Dubnow VI p. 18
(4) Simon Dubnow, *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland,* Philadelphia 1920, III p. 10

UNDER THE CRESCENT

(1) Martin Hartmann, *Der Islam,* p. 179ff.
(2) A full bibliography of this literature has been compiled by Moritz Steinschneider in his *Polemische und Apologetische Literatur in Arabischer Sprache zwischen Muslimen, Christen und Juden.* Cf. also Ignaz Goldziher's discussion in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschmorgenlaendischen Gesellschaft,* vol. XXXII (1878) 341-87
(3) *Encyclopedia of Islam, Ahl al-Kitab*
(4) Cf. Koran 2, 70; 3, 64; 5, 15; 6, 91
(5) Cf. ibid. 2, 129
(6) E. I. *Dhimma*
(7) Ibid. *Ahl al-Kitab*
(8) Koran 2, 257
(9) Beladhori, *Futuh al Buldan,* ed. by M. J. de Goeje, Leyden 1866, p. 162
(10) E. I. *Ahl al-Kitab*
(11) Ibid. *Dhimma* and cf. A. S. Tritton, *The Caliphs and Their Non-Muslim Subjects,* p. 5ff.

(12) Tritton p. 23
(13) R. Dozy, *Spanish Islam,* London 1913, p. 653
(14) Ibid p. 651ff.
(15) Cited by A. Mez, *Die Renaissance des Islams, Heidelberg* 1923, p. 55
(16) Mez p. 31 and note 3
(17) Tritton p. 75
(18) Ibid. p. 95
(19) Jahiz, *Bayan,* 1, 165
(20) *Musnad Ahmad,* 2, 122. 131. 149 and Bukhari, *Jihad,* no. 93
(21) Tritton
(22) Mez p. 47
(23) Cf. E. I. *Ghiyar* and M. Schreiner, *Notes sur les Juifs dans L'Islam in Revue des Etudes Juives, vol.* XXIX (1894) 206-13
(24) J. Morgan, *Mahometism Explained,* London 1723-25 pp. 11, 297ff., 345
(25) *American Jewish Yearbook,* 1935-36, p. 174
(26) Israel Cohen, *The Journal of a Jewish Traveller,* p. 262ff.
(27) *American Jewish Yearbook,* 1930-31, p. 126
(28) *Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale,* Paris 1865, p. 24ff.

FOREARMED

(1) 1, 12
(2) Viz. Exodus 12, 12; II Samuel 7, 23; Isaiah 46, 1
(3) Cf. Baron I p. 79
(4) Cf. Dubnow, *Weltgeschichte,* I p. 388ff.
(5) II Kings 22, 8; II Chronicles 34, 13
(6) 2, 7
(7) Ezra 7, 2ff.; Nehemiah 8, 1ff.; Bab. T. Sukkah 20a
(8) Cf. Dubnow ibid. II
(9) Cf. Bab. T. Pesachim 57a
(10) Cf. Baron I p. 259 and Graetz IV p. 26ff.
(11) Cf. Baron I p. 108
(12) Ibid. pp. 102 and 289ff.
(13) Ba. T. Gittin 56a
(14) I. H. Weiss, *Dor Dor We-Doreshaw,* Vilna 1904, IV p. 65ff.
(15) Bab. T. Gittin 62a
(16) Pesikta derab Kahana, ed. Buber, 165b
(17) E. g. Bab. T. Berakot 61b
(18) Ibid. Sanhedrin 14a
(19) Ibid. Shabbat 33b
(20) Cf. Cecil Roth, *A History of the Marranos*
(21) Pal. T. Berakot II

THE REBIRTH OF A PEOPLE

(1) From the Basle Platform
(2) All the details of Herzl's life and achievements cited here are based on the biographies of Herzl compiled by Alex Bein and Jacob de Haas
(3) Cf. Alex Bein, *Theodor Herzl,* Vienna 1935, p. 327
(4) The expression "Israelites are children of kings" is already met with in the early rabbinic sources
(5) The sources used here for events in Zionist history up to the end of the first world war are Nahum Sokolow's *History of Zionism,* Jessie E. Sampter's *A Guide to Zionism* and Judah L. Fishman's *History of the Mizrachi Movement*
(6) Viz. the proceedings of the Zionist congresses
(7) For a graphic account viz. Maurice Samuel's *What Happened in Palestine,* Boston 1929

THE HOLY CITIES OF THE HOLY LAND

(1) Zechariah 2, 16
(2) Deuteronomy 11, 12
(3) Mishnah Kelim 1, 6
(4) Bab. T. Shabbat 14b
(5) Ibid. Hullin 7a et al.
(6) Ibid. Niddah 47a
(7) Leviticus 26, 31
(8) Mishnah Megillah 3, 3
(9) Mishnah Kelim 1, 6

(10) Numbers 13, 22
(11) Genêsis 23, 1
(12) Numbers 13, 22; Joshua 14, 15
(13) Numbers 13, 33
(14) Genesis 13, 18
(15) Ibid. 23, 17
(16) Ibid. 49, 31
(17) Cf. Abel, *Syrie et Palestine*
(18) Genesis 35, 27; 37, 14
(19) Joshua 10, 5
(20) Ibid. 14, 14; 15, 13; Judges 1, 20
(21) Joshua 20, 7; 21, 13
(22) Ibid. 21, 11; I Chronicles 6, 40
(23) Joshua 21, 12
(24) II Samuel 2, 4
(25) Ibid. 5, 5
(26) Ibid. 5, 6ff.
(27) Ibid. 15, 10
(28) II Chronicles 11, 10
(29) Nehemiah 11, 25
(30) I Maccabees 5, 62 and Josephus, *Antiquities,* 12, 8, 6
(31) Josephus, *Wars,* 1, 9, 7; 4, 9, 9
(32) G. Le Strange, *Palestine Under the Moslems,* p. 309ff.
(33) Ben-Gurion and Ben-Zevi, *Eretz Israel,* New York 1918, p. 275
(34) M. N. Adler, *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela,* p. 25
(35) Ben-Gurion and Ben-Zevi ibid.
(36) J. E. *Hebron*
(37) Ben-Gurion and Ben-Zevi p. 276
(38) Abel p. 616
(39) Ibid. p. 564ff.
(40) Mishnah Kelim 1, 7
(41) Ibid. 1, 8
(42) Ibid. 1, 8. 9
(43) Genesis 14, 18
(44) J. E. *Jerusalem*
(45) Joshua 10, 5
(46) II Samuel 5, 6ff.; I Chronicles 11, 4
(47) II Samuel 24, 24
(48) II Chronicles 3, 1
(49) I Kings 14, 25
(50) II Kings 19, 26; II Chronicles 32, 21
(51) II Kings 20, 20; II Chronicles 32, 30
(52) II Kings 24, 1ff.
(53) Cf. Josephus, *Wars*
(54) Cf. II Kings 12, 5ff. and Mishnah Shekalim
(55) Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities,* 17, 9, 3
(56) Exodus 23, 17
(57) Mishnah Ta'anit 4, 2
(58) Mishnah Middot 5, 4
(59) Cf. Jacob Mann, *The Jews in Egypt and Palestine Under the Fatimids,* I p. 43
(60) Cf. Ben-Gurion and Ben-Zevi, J. E. *Jerusalem* and the statistics in the *American Jewish Yearbook*
(61) Abel
(62) Graetz IV p. 134
(63) Bab. T. Rosh Hashanah 31a
(64) J. E. *Antipas*
(65) Ibid. *Tiberias*
(66) Cf. Israel Davidson, *Mahzor Yannai*
(67) Graetz V p. 28ff.
(68) Mann I p. 46ff.
(69) J. E. *Massorites* and *Vocalization*
(70) Graetz IX p. 380
(71) Abel p. 519 and J. E. *Tiberias*
(72) Pal. T. Rosh Hashanah 58a top
(73) J. E. *Safed*
(74) Dubnow, *Weltgeschichte,* VI p. 28ff.
(75) Ibid. p. 29
(76) S. Schechter, *Studies in Judaism,* 2nd series, p. 202ff.
(77) Baedeker 1912
(78) Jessie Sampter, *Modern Palestine,* p. 140

IT SOLD MORE COPIES THAN "GONE WITH THE WIND"

(1) I. e. the title of the popular novel by Margaret Mitchell published several years ago the sales of which ran into the millions
(2) I. e. the tractate Abot of the Mishnah
(3) Genesis 45, 3ff.
(4) I Samuel 18, 1ff.
(5) Genesis 18, 1ff.
(6) Ruth 1, 16ff.
(7) Genesis 4, 5ff.
(8) Ibid. 27, 41ff.
(9) Ibid. 37, 4ff.
(10) Ibid. 16, 4ff.

(11) Ibid. 30, 1ff.
(12) Ibid. 3, 6ff.
(13) Numbers 26, 11
(14) Genesis 27, 1ff.
(15) II Samuel 15, 6ff.
(16) Genesis 1, 1ff.
(17) Ibid. 12, 1ff.
(18) Exodus 1, 1ff.
(19) Joshua 1, 1ff.; Judges 1, 1ff.
(20) II Samuel 1, 1ff.; I Kings 1, 1ff.; I Chronicles 11, 1ff.
(21) Ezra 1, 1ff.; Nehemiah 1, 1ff.
(22) E. g. 2, 11ff.; 3, 8ff.; 4, 2ff.; 6, 1ff.; 10, 6ff.; 13, 1ff.
(23) Deuteronomy 4, 8
(24) Ibid. 10, 19
(25) Leviticus 25, 55
(26) Exodus 21, 27
(27) This phrase is current in the festival liturgy
(28) Thus in the decalogue Exodus 20, 10
(29) Deuteronomy 5, 14. 15
(30) Cf. Samuel Rosenblatt, *The High Ways to Perfection of Abraham Maimonides,* New York 1927, p. 143
(31) Leviticus 11, 2ff.; Deuteronomy 14, 3ff.
(32) Leviticus 18, 6ff.
(33) Ibid. 18, 28
(34) Deuteronomy 16, 20
(35) Leviticus 19, 15. 35
(36) Ibid. 22, 24
(37) Deuteronomy 16, 19
(38) Leviticus 19, 36
(39) Ibid. 19, 11
(40) Ibid. 19, 13
(41) Ibid. 19, 14
(42) Exodus 22, 21
(43) Leviticus 19, 13
(44) Isaiah 1, 11ff.
(45) Ibid. 1, 23
(46) Amos 4, 1ff.
(47) Isaiah 7, 3ff.
(48) Jeremiah 6, 14
(49) Isaiah 36, 6
(50) Hosea 14, 4
(51) Isaiah 2, 4; Micah 4, 3
(52) Isaiah 11, 6
(53) Ibid. 40, 1. 2
(54) Ibid. 52, 7. 8. 9
(55) Ezekiel 37, 1-14
(56) verse 10
(57) verse 4
(58) Psalms 22, 2
(59) Ibid. 19, 2
(60) verse 1
(61) Cf. especially psalms 122, 125, 126, 128, 132 and 133
(62) Psalm 15
(63) Proverbs 15, 1
(64) Ibid. 6, 6. 7
(65) Ibid. 6, 16. 17. 18
(66) Ecclesiastes 7, 26
(67) Proverbs 31, 10. 11
(68) 18, 22

THE KING'S ENGLISH

(1) Cf. *Encyclopedia Britannica,* 14th edition, *Gothic Language*
(2) Cf. Max Margolis, *The Story of Bible Translations,* p. 69
(3) Gannett and Gosse, *History of English Literature,* I p. 19
(4) E. B. *Polish Literature* and *Russian Literature*
(5) p. 204
(6) Ibid. p. 205
(7) E. B. *The Bible and English Literature: The Puritans*
(8) no. 405
(9) I. e. sop, insane, slaughterer, bankrupt, declare oneself bankrupt.
(10) Genesis 3, 19
(11) Ibid. 4, 19
(12) Ibid. 45, 18
(13) Exodus 3, 8
(14) Deuteronomy 32, 10
(15) Joshua 23, 14
(16) Judges 20, 8
(17) I Samuel 13, 14
(18) II Samuel 1, 25
(19) I Kings 9, 7
(20) Job 19, 20
(21) Psalms 84, 7
(22) Ecclesiastes 1, 2
(23) Isaiah 40, 15
(24) Act 2 Scene 4

(25) Numbers 2, 2
(26) Act 4 Scene 3
(27) Proverbs 17, 22
(28) Act 4 Scene 4
(29) I Samuel 16, 6
(30) Act 5 Scene 3
(31) II Samuel 22, 51
(32) Rosenau p. 64ff.
(33) *Select Masterpieces of Biblical Literature,* Introduction p. 14
(34) Bab. T. Megillah 9a
(35) Letter of Aristeas of the Pseudepigrapha
(36) Cf. Gannett and Gosse and E. B. *Bible, English*
(37) G. A. Smith, *The Legacy of Israel*
(38) *Selden's Table Talk, The Expositor,* April 1878

THE SCROLL AND THE CROSS

(1) Bab. T. Shabbat 31a
(2) 19, 18
(3) Cf. the code of Maimonides Hilkot Tefillah 1, 1
(4) Viz. James Hastings, *A Dictionary of the Bible,* New York 1899, *Law* (in New Testament)
(5) Matthew 5, 17ff.; Luke 16, 14-17
(6) It is composed of liturgical selections like those cited in Bab. T. Berakot 60b and the introduction to the daily Kedushah (prayer proclaiming the sanctity of God)
(7) Bab. T. Yebamot 46a
(8) Exodus 12, 18
(9) Mishnah Pesachim 10, 1
(10) D. B. *Sabbath*
(11) Cf. ibid. *Easter* and *Pentecost*
(12) Cf. Exodus 28, 2ff. and E. B. *Vestments*
(13) A. Z. Idelsohn, *Jewish Music,* New York 1929, p. 61 et al.
(14) Viz. Maimonides' "Articles of the Faith"
(15) Hebrews 8, 7. 8 and cf. D. B. *Law*
(16) Leviticus 24, 20
(17) Sifra ad loc.
(18) Matthew 5, 39
(19) Ibid. 5, 28
(20) Bab. T. Yoma 29a
(21) Ibid. Sanhedrin 6b
(22) Mishnah Makkot 3, 16
(23) Cf. George Foot Moore, *Judaism,* II p. 223ff.
(24) D. B. *Law*
(25) Romans 3, 27. 28; Galatians 2, 16
(26) Deuteronomy 34, 10
(27) Exodus 19, 5
(28) Genesis 17, 9ff.
(29) Exodus 13, 5
(30) Viz. the Jewish festival liturgy
(31) J. E., *Palestine, Laws and Customs Relating to*
(32) Cf. Baron I p. 224ff. & 229
(33) D. B. *Election*
(34) Ibid. *Easter*
(35) Mishnah Pesachim 10, 5
(36) I Corinthians 11, 24. 25
(37) Cf. J. E. *Ruth*
(38) Cf. Baron I p. 135
(39) The entire subject is exhaustively treated by Elie Benamozegh in his *Israel et l'Humanite,* Paris 1914
(40) Isaiah 42, 6
(41) Ibid. 2, 3
(42) D. B. *Fall*
(43) Exodus 20, 5
(44) Cf. Mekilta ad loc. and Bab. T. Berakot 7a
(45) Ezekiel 18, 19
(46) J. E. *Messiah* and D. B. *Jesus*
(47) Cf. E. B. *Christianity*
(48) Cf. D. B. *Marriage*
(49) Joseph Karo, *Shulchan 'Aruk, Eben Ha'ezer* 1, 1, based on Bab. T. Yebamot 63b and Genesis 1, 28

MOHAMMED'S JEWISH TEACHERS

(1) Cf. above "Under the Crescent" notes 32 and 34
(2) Cf. ibid. note 8
(3) Ibid. note 7
(4) E. I. *Ahl al-Kitab* and *Dhimma*
(5) Cf. J. E. *Mohammed*
(6) Cf. ibid. *Islam* and I. Goldziher, *Vorlesungen Ueber den Islam,* Heidelberg 1913

(7) T. Noeldeke, *Geschichte des Korans,* Leipzig 1907. I p. 2ff.
(8) Ibid. pp. 9 & 17
(9) Koran 28, 5. 7; 29, 38
(10) Ibid. 2, 250
(11) Goldziher p. 9ff.
(12) J. E. *Islam*
(13) Goldziher p. 13
(14) Cf. ibid. p. 14
(15) Koran 2, 286; 4, 158; 7, 156
(16) I. Goldziher, *Die Sabbathinstitution im Islam,* in *Kaufmann Gedenkbuch,* p. 86-101. Cf. also Koran 50, 37
(17) Koran 2, 136 and J. E. *Islam*
(18) Koran 2, 119 and J. E. *Islam*
(19) E. g. Genesis 12, 8
(20) Thus C. C. Torrey, *The Jewish Foundations of Islam,* New York 1933 as against H. Preserved Smith, *The Bible and Islam,* London 1898. See also Noeldeke I p. 6ff.
(21) Koran 112
(22) Cf. E. Mittwoch, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Islamischen Gebets und Cultus,* in *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie,* 1913
(23) Torrey p. 138
(24) A. Geiger, *Was Hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthume Aufgenommen,* 2nd edition, Leipzig 1902, p. 47ff.
(25) Geiger p. 120ff.
(26) Cf. Israel schapiro, *Die Haggadischen Elemente im Erzaehlenden Teil des Korans,* Berlin 1907, p. 41
(27) J. E. *Islam,* Geiger, Noeldeke and Torrey
(28) Torrey p. 59
(29) J. E. *Islam*
(30) Goldziher, *Vorlesungen,* p. 12ff.
(31) D. B. Macdonald
(32) Goldziher ibid. p. 40ff.
(33) Ibid. p. 41ff.
(34) Ibid. p. 53
(35) D. B. Macdonald, *Development of Muslim Theology*
(36) R. A. Nicholson, *Mystics of Islam,* London 1914
(37) Goldziher p. 218
(38) Ibid. p. 230ff.
(39) Cf. Graetz V p. 131 and Dubnow III p. 207ff.
(40) Graetz V p. 191
(41) Ibid. p. 287
(42) Viz. especially the poems of Samuel Hanagid and Moses ibn Ezra
(43) Kusari 2, 70ff.
(44) Yellin and Abrahams, *Maimonides,* p. 155
(45) S. Munk, *Melange de Philosophie Juive et Arabe,* Paris 1927, pp. 427 & 439ff.
(46) Philip K. Hitti, *History of the Arabs,* London 1937, p. 484

GOD HAS NOT CHANGED

(1) 3, 6
(2) Cf. J. Sarachek, *Faith and Reason,* Williamsport Pa. 1935
(3) A. Erman, *Die Religion der Aegypter,* Berlin 1934 p. 107ff.
(4) Cf. Wilhelm Windelband, *Geschichte der Philosophie,* Tuebingen 1921 p. 29ff.
(5) Viz. W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity,* Baltimore 1940, p. 165ff.
(6) E. B. *Christianity*
(7) Cf. Exodus 6, 2 and Mishnah Abot 1, 1
(8) Viz. Louis Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews,* Philadelphia 1913, I p. 189ff.
(9) J. E. Monotheism p. 660
(10) Albright p. 207
(11) Exodus 18, 11
(12) 4, 39
(13) 43, 10
(14) Judges 11, 24
(15) 2, 5
(16) Psalms 96, 5
(17) E. G. Exodus 20, 4 and Leviticus 19, 4
(18) Cf. Erman
(19) Viz. Morris Jastrow, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria,* 1898
(20) E. B. *Sophists*
(21) Ibid. *Greek Religion*

(22) Numbers 23, 19
(23) Leviticus 19, 2
(24) Deuteronomy 32, 4
(25) Viz. what happened when the Roman emporer Caligula demanded that his statue be set up in the Temple of Jerusalem: Josephus, *Antiquities,* 18, 8
(26) 33, 18
(27) Ibid. 33, 23
(28) Isaiah 63, 9
(29) Mekilta derabbi Simon ben Yochai, ed. Hoffmann, beginning
(30) Exodus 25, 8
(31) 9, 6
(32) See Rashi on Exodus 33, 23
(33) Thus Bereshit Rabba 5, 4
(34) Ibid. 33, 4
(35) Ibid. 68
(36) See above
(37) Moses Maimonides, *Guide of the Perplexed,* 1, 75. Cf. Isaac Husik, *A History of Medieval Jewish Philosophy,* New York 1930, p. 461 *Unity of God*
(38) *Guide* 1, 38
(39) From the "Articles of the Faith"
(40) Cf. Husik xlviii ff. and p. 454
(41) Ibid. p. 454
(42) Ibid. p. xlvii
(43) E. B. *Mechanism*
(44) Psalms 68, 6
(45) Proverbs 27, 24

"WITH ALL THY LIFE"

(1) Deuteronomy 6, 4-9, the Jewish confession of faith
(2) Viz. above "Forearmed"
(3) Bab. T. Horayot 13a
(4) J. E. *Akiba Ben Joseph*
(5) Bab. T. Gittin 56a ff.
(6) Viz. above "Forearmed"
(7) See references in L. Finkelstein, *Akiba,* p. 326 note 33
(8) E. g. Bab. T. Yebamot 16a
(9) Sifre on Deuteronomy 11, 22
(10) Bamidbar Rabba. Cf. Weiss II p. 98ff.
(11) Bab. T. Menachot 29b
(12) A. Hyman, *Toledot Tannaim we-Amoraim,* London 1910, III p. 988
(13) Bab. T. Berakot 27b
(14) Semachot 8
(15) Abot derabbi Nathan 6
(16) Bab. T. Pesachim 49b
(17) Ibid. Ketubot 62b
(18) Mishnah Nedarim 11, 4. Cf. Finkelstein p. 190 and notes
(19) Abot derabbi Nathan 6
(20) Mishnah Abot 4, 20
(21) Pal. T. Pesachim chapter 6 halakah 3
(22) Judges 9, 38
(23) Bab. T. Berakot 27b and Bekorot 36a
(24) Cf. J. E. *Akiba Ben Joseph*
(25) Viz. references in Finkelstein p. 326 note 33
(26) Cf. Weiss II p. 101ff. and J. E. *Akiba Ben Joseph*
(27) Genesis 1, 1
(28) Bereshit Rabba ad loc. and Bab. T. Yebamot 62a
(29) Cf. Finkelstein p. 89ff.
(30) Deuteronomy 10, 20
(31) Bab. T. Pesachim 22b. The reading there is "Simeon or Nehemiah the Amsonite"
(32) Mishnah Ketubot 9, 2
(33) Bab. T. Yebamot 92a
(34) Ibid. Baba Kamma 46b
(35) J. E. *Akiba Ben Joseph* p. 307a
(36) Cf. Finkelstein p. 173 note 96
(37) Cf. Sifre on Deuteronomy 17, 47. Rabbi Simon reflects the view of Rabbi Akiba
(38) Finkelstein 134ff.
(39) Cf. Mishnah Gittin 9, 10 and Finkelstein p. 188
(40) Mishnah Yebamot 4, 13
(41) Bab. T. Hagigah 14b
(42) Mishnah Abot 3, 15
(43) Bab. T. Berakot 33b
(44) Cf. Finkelstein p. 130
(45) Ibid. p. 136ff.
(46) Mishnah Yebamot 16, 7
(47) Cf. Weiss II p. 65ff.
(48) Bab. T. Rosh Hashanah 25a

(49) Ibid. Berakot 27b ff.
(50) Finkelstein p. 143
(51) Graetz IV p. 106ff.
(52) Bab. T. Sanhedrin 74a ff.
(53) Graetz IV p. 135ff.
(54) Pal. T. Ta'anit 68d
(55) Numbers 24, 17
(56) Bab. T. Berakot 61b
(57) Ibid. Pesachim 112a
(58) Ibid. 109a
(59) Mishnah Yebamot 12, 5; Pal. T. Yebamot 12d
(60) Bab. T. Berakot 61b
(61) Deuteronomy 6, 5
(62) Ibid. 6, 4
(63) Cf. e. g. Mishnah Ta'anit 4, 4 and see also J. S. Zuri, *Rabbi Akiba,* Jerusalem 1924 p. 28
(64) Bab. T. Yebamot 16a
(65) Ibid. Nedarim 40a
(66) Ibid. Mo'ed Katan 21b
(67) Ibid. Makkot 24b end

FROM MOSES TO MOSES

(1) For his biography see Yellin and Abrahams, *Maimonides,* Philadelphia 1903
(2) Viz. Husik, Introduction
(3) Cf. Introduction to the *Guide*
(4) *Guide* beginning of book I
(5) Viz. Husik p. 241ff.
(6) *Der "Fuehrer" Maimunis in der Weltliteratur*
(7) Ibid. p. 341
(8) See Jakob Guttmann's article in *Moses Ben Maimon,* Leipzig 1908, I p. 137ff.
(9) Cf. Joseph Ratner, *The Philosophy of Spinoza*
(10) J. Muenz, *Maimonides,* Boston 1935, p. 171ff.

A GIFT TO FRANCE

(1) Liber, *Rashi,* Philadelphia 1926
(2) Cf. Yellin and Abrahams, *Maimonides*
(3) Liber p. 200
(4) Ibid. p. 201
(5) Ibid. p. 96
(6) J. E. *England*
(7) *Les Gloses Francaises dans les Commentaires Talmudiques de Raschi,* Paris 1929, ed. David S. Blondheim
(8) *Les Gloses Francaises dans Les Commentaires Talmudiques de Raschi,* tome deux, Paris 1937
(9) J. E. *Typography*

THE MINNESINGER OF ZION

(1) From the "Ode to Zion," p. 3 of H. Brody's edition of *Selected Poems of Jehudah Halevi,* Philadelphia 1928
(2) Cf. ibid. Introduction
(3) Ibid. p. 168
(4) From the translation in J. E. *Judah Ha-Levi*
(5) *Heinrich Heines Saemtliche Werke,* ed. Ernst Elster, Berlin and Vienna 1890, I p. 446
(6) Brody p. 2. Translation by Emma Lazarus cited in the English ed. of Graetz's *History of the Jews,* Philadelphia 1894, III p. 337
(7) Brody p. 157
(8) Ibid. p. 10
(9) Ibid. p. 23
(10) Ibid. p. 14ff.
(11) Translation by Emma Lazarus cited in Graetz ibid. p. 339
(12) Brody p. 3

MORRES SHUGER

Morres Shuger, to whom this volume of essays is dedicated, was born in Saroka, Bessarabia. A product of the private Hebrew schools of his native city, he evinced as an apprentice in an Odessa factory such talent for mechanical invention, that his employers offered to let him complete his education in any technical school of his choosing provided that he would change his religion. Rejecting this offer the then youth of eighteen determined to seek his fortune elsewhere. Wending his way to Turkey he finally settled in Argentina, where he became the representative of leading North-American manufacturers of machinery. He had been in South America no more than six years when ill health compelled him to change his habitat. He, therefore, moved with his family to the United States, establishing himself in Baltimore, where he together with his sons founded the Baltimore Paint and Color Works, a leading concern in its field, of which he is today the President.

Mr. Shuger has inherited his penchant for philanthropy from his mother, who enjoyed in Provincia de Entre Rios a great reputation for benevolence. For several decades an outstanding figure in the Independent Order Brith Sholom and other fraternal organizations, he has been closely identified with synagogue life in Baltimore, but above all with the Anshei Sholom Congregation. He contributes liberally to charitable institutions, non-Jewish as well as Jewish, and stands close to the Jewish national movement. The chief recipients of his benefactions, however, have been Jewish educational institutions and men of learning of the traditional type. A staunch adherent of Orthodoxy he has by means of his singular generosity shown an example to his Jewish fellow-citizens in the noble work of rescuing from certain annihilation, as a result of the ravages of the present world war, the teachers and pupils of the celebrated Yeshibot of Eastern Europe. The encouragement that he has by his deeds leant to the preservation of the Jewish spiritual heritage entitle him to be ranked among the most deserving sons of "the people of the book."

Date Due			
[redacted]			
[illegible] 3 '45			
O 31 '45			
D 14 '45			
[illegible] 28 '46			
[redacted]			

DS143 .R81
The people of the Book,
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00023 0781